

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 997

IR 000 623

AUTHOR Palmour, Vernon E.; And Others  
 TITLE Methods of Financing Interlibrary Loan Services.  
 INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.  
 SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.  
 F38 DATE Feb 74  
 NOTE 128p.  
 AVAILABLE FROM Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (\$3.50)  
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$6.60 PLUS POSTAGE  
 DESCRIPTORS College Libraries; \*Costs; \*Financial Problems; \*Financial Support; \*Interlibrary Loans; Library Planning; Library Research; Library Surveys; University Libraries

## ABSTRACT

Various methods of financing interlibrary loans were investigated in this study requested by the Association of Research Libraries and funded with a grant from the National Science Foundation. The history and background of interlibrary loan service is examined, and existing financing methods and the cost of service in academic libraries is discussed. It was found that larger academic libraries bear a disproportionate amount of the load. Criteria and goals for evaluating alternative financing methods are set forth. An economically viable system with a more equitable cost distribution was sought. After consideration of alternative financing methods and fee system options, a fee structure is recommended which would recover partial costs for the lending library by utilizing coupons sold and redeemed at a central clearinghouse. This solution is viewed as a short-term improvement of the current system. The study recommends that State or Federal subsidies eventually replace fees.  
 (JG)

ED 090997

**METHODS OF FINANCING  
INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICES**

**By**

**Vernon E. Palmour**

**Edwin E. Olson**

**Nancy K. Roderer**



ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

000 000 000

7R 000 003

ED 090997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

METHODS OF FINANCING  
INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICES

By

Vernon E. Palmour  
Edwin E. Olson  
Nancy K. Roderer

For

The Association of Research Libraries  
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

(National Science Foundation Grant GN 35571)

Westat, Inc.  
11600 Nebel Street  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

February 1974

Copyright © 1974 Association of Research Libraries

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-  
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Association of  
Research Libraries

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING  
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-  
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO-  
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-  
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT  
OWNER."



## FOREWORD

The Association of Research Libraries is pleased to acknowledge the interest and support of the Office of Science Information Service, National Science Foundation, which provided the funding for this study. This report has been prepared at the request of the Association of Research Libraries. Members of the ARL Advisory Committee, the ARL staff and others have contributed in various ways to the conduct of the study and the preparation of the report.

The conclusions and recommendations of the report are those of the contractor. They do not necessarily represent the views of the Association of Research Libraries.

The Association does take the position that the financing of library activities must be conceived on a different plane than in the past, or such services as interlibrary loans will require subsidization from some source, if they are to be continued.

Stephen A. McCarthy  
Executive Director  
Association of Research Libraries

February 20, 1974

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>Chapter</u> |                                                                       | <u>Page</u> |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1              | SUMMARY . . . . .                                                     | 1           |
| 2              | INTRODUCTION . . . . .                                                | 3           |
|                | 2.1 Background . . . . .                                              | 3           |
|                | 2.2 Problem - Scope of Study . . . . .                                | 5           |
|                | 2.3 Study Plan . . . . .                                              | 7           |
| 3              | EXISTING METHODS OF FINANCING ILL . . . . .                           | 9           |
|                | 3.1 Past History of ILL Financing . . . . .                           | 9           |
|                | 3.2 Summary of Current ILL Financing . . . . .                        | 10          |
|                | 3.3 Emerging Patterns . . . . .                                       | 11          |
| 4              | THE COSTS OF ILL SERVICES . . . . .                                   | 13          |
|                | 4.1 The Cause for Concern: ILL Load as Burden . . . . .               | 13          |
|                | 4.2 Measures of Burden . . . . .                                      | 13          |
|                | 4.3 Case Study of Lending Patterns for Seven<br>Libraries . . . . .   | 19          |
|                | 4.4 Attitudes on Lending to Different Types<br>of Libraries . . . . . | 23          |
|                | 4.5 Summary . . . . .                                                 | 26          |
| 5              | GOALS AND CRITERIA . . . . .                                          | 28          |
|                | 5.1 Criteria for Evaluating Alternatives . . . . .                    | 28          |
|                | 5.2 Major Goals . . . . .                                             | 29          |
| 6              | ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO FINANCING ILL . . . . .                     | 31          |
|                | 6.1 Selection of Alternatives . . . . .                               | 31          |
|                | 6.2 Subsidy Alternatives . . . . .                                    | 32          |
|                | 6.3 Charging Net Borrowers . . . . .                                  | 35          |
|                | 6.4 Charging All Borrowers . . . . .                                  | 36          |
|                | 6.5 A Proximate Solution . . . . .                                    | 37          |
| 7              | FEE SYSTEM OPTIONS . . . . .                                          | 38          |
|                | 7.1 Magnitude of Fees for Monograph Loans . . . . .                   | 38          |
|                | 7.2 Libraries Charging Fees . . . . .                                 | 42          |
|                | 7.3 Method of Payment . . . . .                                       | 43          |
|                | 7.4 Description of Optional Systems . . . . .                         | 46          |
|                | 7.5 Fees for Materials Other Than Monographs . . . . .                | 55          |
|                | 7.6 Anticipated Effects of Fee System Options . . . . .               | 59          |
|                | 7.7 Evaluation of Options . . . . .                                   | 61          |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

| <u>Chapter</u> |                                                    | <u>Page</u> |
|----------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 8              | THE RECOMMENDED FEE SYSTEM. . . . .                | 66          |
|                | 8.1 Description of the Recommended System. . . . . | 66          |
|                | 8.2 Implementation . . . . .                       | 66          |
|                | 8.3 Monitoring . . . . .                           | 74          |
|                | 8.4 Concluding Remarks . . . . .                   | 75          |
|                | BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .                              | 77          |
|                | APPENDIX A. . . . .                                | A-1         |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| <u>Figure</u> |                                                                                  |    |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1             | Examples of Current Means for Financing<br>Interlibrary Loans. . . . .           | 12 |
| 2             | Fee System Options. . . . .                                                      | 47 |
| 3             | Fee System Options Compared on Criteria . . . . .                                | 62 |
| 4             | Estimated Annual Income and Operating<br>Expenses for the Clearinghouse. . . . . | 70 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u> |                                                                                                                                    |    |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1            | Distribution of U.S. academic libraries by total<br>volume of lending requests received within col-<br>lection size group. . . . . | 14 |
| 2            | Distribution of net lending libraries by<br>number of lending requests received . . . . .                                          | 15 |
| 3            | Distribution of net lending libraries by<br>lending/borrowing ratio and number of<br>lending requests received . . . . .           | 16 |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

## LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

| <u>Table</u> |                                                                                                                         | <u>Page</u> |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 4            | Lending/borrowing ratios of net lending libraries: ARL and non-ARL libraries compared. . . . .                          | 17          |
| 5            | Percentage of libraries reporting lending burden by volume of lending requests. . . . .                                 | 18          |
| 6            | Percentage of net lending libraries reporting burden by lending/borrowing ratio . . . . .                               | 19          |
| 7            | Percent of loans made by seven net lending libraries to libraries belonging to networks or consortia. . . . .           | 20          |
| 8            | Loans made in-state and out-of-state by seven net lending libraries, by types of libraries. . . .                       | 21          |
| 9            | Attitudes of net borrowers and net lenders about lending to different types of libraries . . .                          | 24          |
| 10           | Types of libraries which should pay for inter-library loan (in-state and out-of-state). . . . .                         | 25          |
| 11           | Directors: attitude on compensation of lending in academic libraries, by collection size of responding library. . . . . | 27          |
| 12           | Percentage of ILL loans made by type and form of material (based on 1,940,000 requests) . . . . .                       | 56          |
| 13           | Maximum net balance, ILL fees, for lending and borrowing libraries . . . . .                                            | 61          |

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Westat was assisted in the study by the ARL Advisory Committee established for the project. The Advisory Committee consisted of the following members: David W. Heron (Chairman), Director, University of Kansas Libraries; Joseph E. Jeffs, Director, Georgetown University Libraries; Louis E. Martin, Librarian, Harvard College Library; Stanley McElderry, Director, The University of Chicago Library; and Gordon R. Williams, Director, The Center for Research Libraries. Stephen A. McCarthy, Executive Director, ARL, and Suzanne Frankie, Assistant Executive Director, ARL, provided direction throughout the course of the study.

C. Dake Gull, Consultant to ARL also contributed to the study. Other contributors were: Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Library Administration, University of Iowa, who served as Liaison with the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; Robert M. Hayes, Executive Vice President, Becker and Hayes, Inc.; Ralph H. Hopp, Director, University of Minnesota Libraries and President, ARL.

We wish to extend our appreciation to the library directors and interlibrary loan librarians who completed our survey forms. Our staff benefited from discussions held with numerous librarians around the country.

Edwin E. Olson, Professor, School of Library and Information Services, University of Maryland, and consultant to Westat, played a key role in all phases of this study. As part of her doctoral studies at Syracuse University, Patricia Moell made valuable contributions in the early phases of the study. Other Westat members making contributions were Edward C. Bryant, Marcia C. Bellassai and Lucy M. Gray.

WESTAT, INC.  
February 1974



## 1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate and make recommendations on methods of financing interlibrary loans. Recommendations were to be made which, if adopted and implemented, would have a high probability of resulting in immediate improvements to the present interlibrary loan system. The primary improvement would be an economically viable system that would recognize the need to distribute the costs in a more equitable manner among participants.

Data were collected, through a survey of academic libraries, that provided insight into the imbalance of the present interlibrary loan system. The findings showed, as expected, that the larger academic libraries are bearing a disproportionate amount of the load, and that this service cannot continue at its current level unless some type of financial relief is provided to these lending libraries.

Various means for financing interlibrary loans were investigated. Four possible fee structures emerged as the best options for detailed study. These options included: 1) a full cost recovery fee system, using coupons with a uniform fee that all libraries could adopt; 2) a full cost recovery fee system, using credit cards with a uniform fee; 3) a partial cost recovery fee system making use of coupons with only the net lenders charging a uniform fee; 4) a variable charge established by each library to recover its costs, using credit cards for payment purposes. Each of these would lead to a more equitable sharing of ILL costs than does the present system. Anticipated implications of each option are presented.



The recommended fee structure is one that, initially, would only recover partial costs for the lending library. It would utilize coupons sold and redeemed by a central clearinghouse. Borrowing libraries would remit one coupon with each interlibrary loan request to a participating library and the coupon would be returned if the request was not filled. It is suggested that the value of the coupon for any item loaned be set initially at \$3.50, or one-half the estimated average lending cost, and adjusted yearly as determined appropriate by an advisory committee. Provision of photocopies could also be included in the fee system with a suggested coupon value of \$3.50 for the first ten pages and \$1.50 for each additional ten pages. The fee could be adjusted upwards over a specified period of time to that of a full cost recovery system.

Adoption of a fee system to provide more equitable sharing of the costs of interlibrary loan is viewed as a short-term alternative to improvement of the present system. In the long-run, state or federal subsidies should replace the need for fees. The perspective taken in this study is that of an individual library manager. A library manager makes decisions that satisfy, primarily, the needs of the parent institution. Consequently, the best solution is of a local nature and provides for recovery of full costs for providing loan services. From a national perspective, the interlibrary loan system may be viewed differently with broader goals.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

### 2.1 Background

Our recent study<sup>1</sup> showed that the volume of interlibrary lending by academic institutions has more than doubled in five years and is expected to increase by 50 percent in the next five years. The rapid growth in lending places a differential burden on academic libraries, depending on size, location and other factors. As originally conceived, interlibrary lending and borrowing was to be a reciprocal kind of operation to extend the collections available to patrons without placing a disproportionate load on any particular institution. In practice, the load is falling heavily upon relatively few institutions and is calling the entire system into question.

It was found, for example, that large academic libraries (those with collections of over 500,000 volumes) receive about three times as many requests as they place with other libraries. Thus, the lending/borrowing ratio is about 3 to 1. The very large university libraries within this group have much higher ratios. It is not unusual for ratios to be 10 to 1 and in some cases very much higher. These ratios show that the reciprocal concept is not working for large academic libraries.

In small academic libraries (those with collections from 20 to 100 thousand volumes) the lending/borrowing ratio is approximately 1 to 1. On the average, then, for this size library

---

<sup>1</sup> Palmour, Vernon E., et al., A Study of the Characteristics, Costs, and Magnitude of Interlibrary Loans in Academic Libraries, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Company, 1972 (NSF Grant No. GN 889 to the Association of Research Libraries).

the principle of reciprocity seems to work. However, there are extremely wide variations from library to library.

Overall, the average lending/borrowing ratio is about 1.7 to 1, showing that academic libraries support a substantial amount of interlibrary loan activity which originates outside the academic community. Thus, the problem is not just one of distributing the load among academic libraries, but also of facing the question of what can be done to relieve the load generated by nonacademic libraries.

Clearly, some revisions in the existing interlibrary loan system are needed. There is a growing concern among librarians that the solution to the interlibrary loan problem should be sought on a national level. These revisions need to be considered soon. Otherwise, large libraries with heavy lending burdens are likely to take unilateral action that will complicate the analysis and evaluation of alternative options on a national level. Unilateral decisions to establish fees for lending or decisions to stop lending may precipitate actions by other libraries and policymakers that could place the entire system in jeopardy.

Some academic librarians who felt the load was becoming more than they could reasonably bear have begun to question the value of interlibrary loan both to themselves and to the larger system. It has been reported that some are thinking of establishing fees high enough to provide some compensation for their service and to force out of the system transactions whose benefits do not exceed their cost.

With the present system, many believe it is only a matter of time until most large lending libraries will be forced to charge for loans. Once several large libraries impose charges,

the following shift in requests to noncharging libraries will force these to start charging also. The institution of charges will result in a chain reaction throughout the library community.

The whole library community is involved in interlibrary loan activities. An improved interlibrary loan system should benefit public, school, and special libraries as well as academic libraries. Recent economic pressures on all types of libraries have increased the need of cooperation at several levels. Libraries are being faced with public demands to be more relevant to the current needs of our society. The time seems ripe for improvement of the interlibrary loan aspect of access to information.

As a first step in the improvement of the interlibrary loan system, this study will focus on immediate measures which can be taken to more equitably distribute the costs of interlibrary loans. More long-range plans are being made and should continue to be made to move towards the ultimate goal of guaranteed access to information.

## 2.2 Problem - Scope of Study

In order to meet head-on a possible impending crisis in the financial bases of the interlibrary loan (ILL) system, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) sponsored this study with support from the National Science Foundation to investigate and make recommendations for improved and economically viable methods of financing an interlibrary loan system for academic libraries. The study was to focus on physical access to materials via the interlibrary system and to suggest alternative means for establishing the present interlibrary loan system on a sounder basis with particular attention to the mechanics and



implications of a suitable fee system. Recommendations were to be made which, if adopted and implemented, would result in immediate improvements to the present system. These recommendations will include the description of procedures for financing the ILL system along with the estimated impact of such a plan upon the current system.

The scope of the study was to be limited to changes which affect the distribution of loans at the national level. The magnitude of lending at the national level was available in terms of loans which cross state boundaries.<sup>2</sup> Consideration was to be given to restrictions at the national level which would encourage borrowing within state or regional boundaries.

Supplementing the results of this study are the recommendations made by Westat in a separately published report<sup>3</sup> concerning the feasibility of a national periodical resources system. This second study approaches the problem of interlibrary loan of periodical materials from the viewpoint of improvement on a national scale, in contrast with a focus on improvement for individual libraries in the study of ILL financing. A third study<sup>4</sup>, conducted by Becker and Hayes, Inc., for ARL, addresses another possible long-term improvement of the ILL system through a computer-based communication system.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Palmour, Vernon E., Bellassai, Marcia C., and Gray, Lucy M., Access to Periodical Resources: A National Plan, Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, February 1974.

<sup>4</sup> Hayes, Robert M., A Study of a System for Interlibrary Communication (SILC), Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, February 1974.



### 2.3 Study Plan

To obtain an initial understanding of questions and concerns that various parts of the library community have about financing methods for ILL, conversations were held with representatives of federal libraries, large and small academic libraries, library systems, and other interested groups. Similar visits were made throughout the study to obtain feedback on proposed systems.

To collect further data on ILL practices and attitudes and opinions of librarians, a questionnaire was prepared and sent to directors and interlibrary loan librarians in a representative sample of 189 academic institutions. Results were used as input to our planning process and in identifying libraries currently receiving compensation for ILL. A number of libraries charging fees or receiving other compensation were visited.

An extended planning process approach<sup>5</sup> was used to consider the problem of the ILL burden in the broadest possible context. This required us to define the goals and objectives critical to the problem, stating them in terms of measurable attributes. Criteria for evaluation of alternatives were identified and applied to possible solutions, resulting in the selection of a plan.

---

<sup>5</sup> See William Greenwood, Decision Theory and Information Systems, Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western Publishing Company, 1969, and Hugh W. Calkins, "An Information System: An Accountability Theory of Policy Analysis," paper delivered at the 1972 Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., September 5-9 (Available from University Microfilms).

The chosen alternative was further broken down by these categories: magnitude of fee, types of libraries which should charge, and method of collection. Data from the present study and from the previous Westat study were utilized to arrive at the specifics of the fee amounts. Methods of collection were investigated by interviews with organizations experienced in various systems. Combinations of elements of the three categories were considered and evaluation criteria again applied to each to determine possible advantages and disadvantages. This resulted in the selection of four options for fee structures responsive to the need for more equitable distribution of ILL costs.

Finally, anticipated effects of the proposed options were discussed. This completed the total package of input to a decision on a recommended method for financing interlibrary loan, and on this basis a fee system was chosen. Methods of implementation, including development of a monitoring system, were detailed for the recommended plan.

### 3. EXISTING METHODS OF FINANCING ILL

#### 3.1 Past History on ILL Financing

As originally conceived, an interlibrary loan system was intended as a means of extending the collections available to patrons without placing an undue burden on any one library. As long as the lending and borrowing patterns were reciprocal, benefits could accrue to the user groups of both borrower and lender. Even at the outset of major interlibrary loan implementation programs, however, the fact was recognized that the direction of flow of materials would generally be from the "haves" to the "have-nots" -- from the large libraries with large collections to smaller libraries for whom interlibrary loan could serve as a supplement to their own collections. Accordingly, some (although usually not adequate) extra compensation was sometimes given (higher state support, for example) to encourage large libraries to act as resource centers for interlibrary loan requests.

Motivations other than money might also have accounted for the willingness of potentially large net lenders to enter into library loan arrangements. Perhaps like the scientific research community, large academic research libraries sought the "prestige of dissemination" -- prestige as a reward for the service of providing ideas or materials to a large community. Perhaps they also perceived other societal benefits from making their academic resources more widely available.

When resources available for library services diminish or suffer increased competition from other public or university services, however, the benefits of each service in comparison to the cost and the degree of institutional responsibility to provide

that service must be considered. For large research libraries with well-established reputations, the prestige increments associated with interlibrary loan service must have long since passed the point of diminishing returns. Also, one can assume that these libraries feel a primary responsibility to serve first their own university patrons or at most the patrons whose tax monies support the library.

The literature concerning the development of specific financial arrangements to cope with an increasing ILL load is very sparse. Most thinking about the subject has been in relation to the development of networks or consortia by libraries within a common political jurisdiction, e.g., metropolitan consortia, or by libraries of the same type and size, e.g., academic consortia. Special financial arrangements for lending by medical libraries have been developed for the hierarchical Regional Medical Library Program (RMLP) of the National Library of Medicine (NLM).

Apart from these examples which shed little light on the present problem of interstate lending, we could find no study which discussed the national problem or presented any clear alternatives. Library literature records only a few laments of hard-pressed libraries.<sup>6</sup>

### 3.2 Summary of Current ILL Financing

The current pattern of ILL is a patchwork of state subsidies for networks; state subsidies for individual library memberships in an ILL network; national support for certain types

---

<sup>6</sup> For example: Kaser, David, "Whither Interlibrary Loan?" College and Research Libraries 33:5:398-402 (September 1972); Shollenberger, Richard C., "Oh, That Library Loan," RQ 11:4:343-345 (Summer 1972).



of lending libraries, notably medical libraries; charges by lending libraries for loans to business and industry; charges for photocopies by many libraries (although many of the larger do not consider providing photocopies to the libraries as an ILL activity); and subsidization of the lending activity by the lending library.

It is this last financial arrangement which gave rise to this study -- that is, the ILL activity done by those libraries who lend more than they borrow and who choose to lend to libraries without levying any charges, except for charges to reimburse mailing costs. Figure 1 presents the major ways the ILL system is currently financed and gives examples which show the great variation in these categories.

### 3.3 Emerging Patterns

The prevailing philosophy in many universities is to recover costs. Transactions with other universities are seen as a reasonable place to begin, perhaps because ILL is usually considered to be a secondary activity. The main mission of a library is generally considered to be service to its direct clientele, with service to other libraries of lesser importance.

Nonetheless, most librarians do recognize some obligation to share their resources and thus would like to continue services such as interlibrary loan. When faced with the spiraling costs of their library operation, however, they feel it necessary to explore alternatives. Charges are seen by some as a means by which they can accommodate the demand for ILL and still be responsive to the university's concern about recovering costs. For example, Wayne State University recently initiated a \$3.00 charge for satisfying the standard ILL request.



Figure 1. Examples of Current Means for Financing Interlibrary Loans

State Subsidies

- New York - participation grant plus \$1.00 or \$2.50/search plus \$2.00/filled request to NYSILL referral centers
- Illinois - participation grant plus \$1.00 or \$1.25/search plus \$2.00/filled request to resource libraries
- Minnesota - state funding to MINITEX

ILL Fees

- Wisconsin - membership fee from participating libraries to WILS
- Wayne State University Library - \$3.00/transaction
- Peabody Library (Harvard) - \$1.00 or \$5.00/transaction plus postage

ILL Services to Industry

- Regional Information and Communication Exchange (RICE) - \$ .50 search plus \$1.00 handling
- Stanford Technical Information Service - \$5.00/transaction

Photocopy Fees

- The John Crerar Library - \$.30/page plus \$1.50
- Northwestern University Library - \$.10/page plus \$2.00
- Selected Pennsylvania Libraries<sup>7</sup> - \$.10/copy  
\$.10/copy plus postage  
\$.25/copy plus \$1.00

---

<sup>7</sup> Op. cit., Schollenberger, Richard C.

#### 4. THE COSTS OF ILL SERVICES

##### 4.1 The Cause for Concern: ILL Load as Burden

The ILL load experienced by libraries is of concern for both the direct cost factors and other associated factors such as photocopying load, loss of local use, deterioration of materials, and the like. Quantitative evidence related to these factors is provided by the survey of 189 academic libraries performed by Westat. The survey methodology and detailed tables are given in Appendix A, but it should be noted here that the sample design provided for greater representation of large libraries and that the tables are unweighted and thus maintain this disproportionate representation.

##### 4.2 Measures of Burden

To understand the aspects of the ILL load which are most troublesome for libraries, we attempted to obtain measures of "burden." Three varieties of burden have been defined -- absolute, relative, and perceived -- with limits for each based on the interrelationships among the three. Absolute burden is based on the total number of lending requests received by a library; if more than 3,000 requests are received in a year the library is identified as bearing an absolute burden.

Relative burden is associated with net lending. The numbers of lending requests received and borrowing requests made by a library are used to determine its lending/borrowing ratio; if lending exceeds borrowing the library is identified as a net lender.

Perceived burden is defined as a "yes" response to the survey question "Is the volume of ILL lending at your library a burden on your resources and services?"

The sample of libraries is broken down by number of loan requests and by size of library in Table 1. The table

Table 1. Distribution of U.S. academic libraries by total volume of lending requests received within collection size group.

| Number of Lending Requests Received<br>in One Year* | Collection Size of Lending<br>Library (volumes) |                      |                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
|                                                     | 20,000 -<br>99,999                              | 100,000 -<br>499,999 | 500,000<br>and up |
| 1 - 299                                             | 91%                                             | 39%                  | -                 |
| 300 - 999                                           | 9%                                              | 35%                  | 8%                |
| 1,000 - 1,999                                       | -                                               | 17%                  | 11%               |
| 2,000 - 2,999                                       | -                                               | 9%                   | 13%               |
| 3,000 - 4,999                                       | -                                               | -                    | 18%               |
| 5,000 - 6,999                                       | -                                               | -                    | 15%               |
| 7,000 - 9,999                                       | -                                               | -                    | 9%                |
| 10,000 - 14,999                                     | -                                               | -                    | 17%               |
| 15,000 +                                            | -                                               | -                    | 8%                |
| Total**                                             | 100%                                            | 100%                 | 99%               |
| Number of libraries in sample                       | 15                                              | 30                   | 102               |
| Number reporting number of lending<br>requests      | 11                                              | 23                   | 96                |

\* Some respondents reported data from 1972 calendar year and other reported for the 71-72 academic year.

\*\* Does not always equal 100 percent due to rounding error.

clearly indicates that the absolute burden in the ILL system falls upon the large libraries. While none of the libraries

with a collection size of less than 500,000 received more than 3,000 requests for materials in one year, 67 percent of the large libraries (500,000+) received more than 3,000 requests. Twenty-five percent of these large libraries were asked for 10,000 or more items. When the absolute burden of lending requests is compared with the ratio of lending to borrowing (relative burden) in Table 2, it is seen that all of the libraries receiving 10,000 or more requests are "net lenders," that is, lend more than they borrow, whereas about half of those libraries receiving less than 3,000 requests are "net borrowers," i.e., they borrow more than they lend.

Table 2. Distribution of net lending libraries by number of lending requests received.

| Number of Lending Requests Received | Number of Libraries Reporting | Percent of Libraries Which are Net Lenders (lend more than they borrow) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 - 999                             | 29                            | 38                                                                      |
| 1,000 - 2,999                       | 31                            | 55                                                                      |
| 3,000 - 4,999                       | 16                            | 94                                                                      |
| 5,000 - 9,999                       | 29                            | 86                                                                      |
| 10,000 - 14,999                     | 16                            | 100                                                                     |
| 15,000 +                            | 13                            | 100                                                                     |
| Total                               | 134                           | 72                                                                      |

A further breakdown of the lending/borrowing ratio for all net lending libraries in Table 3 reveals that the relative burden of those libraries with a greater absolute burden also tends to be greater. For example, over half of those libraries which have over 15,000 lending requests also lend over seven times more than they borrow.

Table 3. Distribution of net lending libraries by lending/borrowing ratio and number of lending requests received

| Lending/Borrowing Ratio     | Number of Lending Requests Received |               |               |               |                 |         | % of All Net Lenders |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------|----------------------|
|                             | 1 - 999                             | 1,000 - 2,999 | 3,000 - 4,999 | 5,000 - 9,999 | 10,000 - 14,999 | 15,000+ |                      |
| 1.01 - 1.5:1                | 64%                                 | 35%           | 33%           | 16%           | -               | 8%      | 24%                  |
| 1.51 - 2.0:1                | 27%                                 | 24%           | 20%           | 28%           | 12%             | -       | 20%                  |
| 2.01 - 3.0:1                | 9%                                  | 18%           | 20%           | 40%           | 19%             | -       | 21%                  |
| 3.01 - 4.0:1                | -                                   | 18%           | 13%           | 8%            | 19%             | -       | 10%                  |
| 4.01 - 5.0:1                | -                                   | -             | 13%           | 4%            | 6%              | 23%     | 7%                   |
| 5.01 - 7.0:1                | -                                   | 6%            | -             | -             | 25%             | 15%     | 7%                   |
| > 7.0:1                     | -                                   | -             | -             | 4%            | 19%             | 54%     | 11%                  |
| Total*                      | 100%                                | 101%          | 99%           | 100%          | 100%            | 100%    | 100%                 |
| Total Number of Net Lenders | 11                                  | 17            | 15            | 25            | 16              | 13      | 97                   |

\* Does not always equal 100 percent due to rounding error.



The same breakdown of lending/borrowing ratio is used to show the relationship of burden to ARL membership in Table 4. As might be expected, over 90 percent of the ARL libraries are net lenders, while less than half of non-ARL libraries are net lenders. The breakdown of the magnitude of the lending/borrowing ratio for the net lending libraries also reveals that many ARL libraries have a high ratio of lending to borrowing.

Table 4. Lending/borrowing ratios of net lending libraries:  
ARL and non-ARL libraries compared

| L/B Ratio                                     | Percent of<br>ARL<br>Libraries | Percent of<br>Non-ARL<br>Libraries | Percent of<br>All<br>Libraries |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1.01 - 1.5:1                                  | 17%                            | 39%                                | 24%                            |
| 1.51 - 2.0:1                                  | 17%                            | 25%                                | 20%                            |
| 2.01 - 3.0:1                                  | 23%                            | 14%                                | 21%                            |
| 3.01 - 4.0:1                                  | 7%                             | 18%                                | 10%                            |
| 4.01 - 5.0:1                                  | 9%                             | 4%                                 | 7%                             |
| 5.01 - 7.0:1                                  | 10%                            | -                                  | 7%                             |
| > 7.0:1                                       | 16%                            | -                                  | 11%                            |
| Total*                                        | 99%                            | 100%                               | 100%                           |
| Number of libraries<br>reporting              | 74                             | 60                                 | 134                            |
| Percent of libraries which<br>are net lenders | 93%                            | 47%                                | 72%                            |

\* Does not always equal 100 percent due to rounding error.

An analysis of differences between public and private academic libraries in their lending/borrowing ratios did not produce any significant differences even when their lending/borrowing ratios were compared separately for each class by size of collection.

Librarians' perceptions of burden for their own library were obtained by the question, "Is the volume of ILL lending at your library a burden on your resources and services?" Of the 133 library directors responding, 66 perceived ILL as a burden.

The relationships between perceived burden and total lending are shown in Table 5. Only 3 percent of the libraries with less than 1,000 loan requests and 34 percent of those with

Table 5. Percentage of libraries reporting lending burden by volume of lending requests

| Volume of Lending Requests Received | Libraries Reporting Burden | Libraries Reporting No Burden | Total | Number of Libraries |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| 1 - 999                             | 3%                         | 97%                           | 100%  | 34                  |
| 1,000 - 2,999                       | 34%                        | 66%                           | 100%  | 29                  |
| 3,000 - 4,999                       | 69%                        | 31%                           | 100%  | 16                  |
| 5,000 - 9,999                       | 54%                        | 46%                           | 100%  | 26                  |
| 10,000 - 14,999                     | 87%                        | 13%                           | 100%  | 15                  |
| 15,000 +                            | 77%                        | 23%                           | 100%  | 13                  |
| Total                               | 44%                        | 56%                           | 100%  | 133                 |

1,000 - 2,999 loan requests perceive a substantial ILL burden, while over 50 percent of all those receiving 3,000 or more loan requests perceive a burden. Perceived burden is also related to relative burden as indicated by Table 6. Fifty-seven percent of the net lending libraries also perceive themselves as having a burden compared to only nine percent of the net borrowers.

Table 6. Percentage of net lending libraries reporting burden by lending/borrowing ratio

| Lending/Borrowing Ratio      | Percent of Net Lending Libraries |                     | Total |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|
|                              | Reporting Burden                 | Reporting No Burden |       |
| 1.01 - 1.5:1                 | 30                               | 70                  | 100%  |
| 1.51 - 2.0:1                 | 47                               | 53                  | 100%  |
| 2.01 - 3.0:1                 | 65                               | 35                  | 100%  |
| 3.01 - 4.0:1                 | 80                               | 20                  | 100%  |
| 4.01 - 5.0:1                 | 67                               | 33                  | 100%  |
| 5.01 - 7.0:1                 | 67                               | 33                  | 100%  |
| > 7.0:1                      | 82                               | 18                  | 100%  |
| Percent of all net lenders   | 57                               | 43                  | 100%  |
| Percent of all net borrowers | 9                                | 91                  | 100%  |
| Number of libraries*         | 57                               | 73                  | 130   |

\* Number varies between tables because all libraries did not answer all questions.

#### 4.3 Case Study of Lending Patterns for Seven Libraries

To further define the distribution of the ILL load, the ILL transactions of seven libraries from the survey sample were studied in detail. The seven libraries were randomly selected from a list of all net lenders so that they represented the range -- from the smallest net lender to the largest. The results of the analysis of the percentage of loans made to various types of libraries by each of the seven libraries is given in Tables 7 and 8. While these results can not be generalized to the universe of net lenders, they do give an indication of the range of lending with each of the specified categories.

Table 7. Percent of loans made by seven net lending libraries to libraries belonging to networks or consortia

|                               | Seven Net Lending Libraries (A-G)* with Ratio of Lending to Borrowing: |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |        |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|
|                               | A                                                                      | B               | C               | D               | E               | F               | G      |
| Loans Made to                 | 1.01 -<br>1.5:1                                                        | 1.51 -<br>2.0:1 | 2.01 -<br>3.0:1 | 3.01 -<br>4.0:1 | 4.01 -<br>5.0:1 | 5.01 -<br>7.0:1 | >7.0:1 |
| Network/Consortia Members**   | 24%                                                                    | -               | 29%             | 2%              | -               | 26%             | 48%    |
| Non-network/Consortia Members | 76%                                                                    | 100%            | 61%             | 98%             | 100%            | 74%             | 52%    |
| ARL Libraries                 | 61%                                                                    | 46%             | 15%             | 9%              | 18%             | 19%             | 18%    |
| Other                         | 15%                                                                    | 54%             | 56%             | 89%             | 82%             | 55%             | 34%    |
| Total                         | 100%                                                                   | 100%            | 100%            | 100%            | 100%            | 100%            | 100%   |

\* Libraries A, B, and F are private academic libraries; C, D, E, and G are public institutions.

\*\* Does not include CRL members.

Table 8. Loans made in-state and out-of-state by seven net lending libraries, by types of libraries:

| Type of Library       | Seven Net Lending Libraries (A-G) with Ratio of Lending to Borrowing: |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |             |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------|
|                       | A<br>1.01 -<br>1.5:1                                                  | B<br>1.51 -<br>2.0:1 | C<br>2.01 -<br>3.0:1 | D<br>3.01 -<br>4.0:1 | E<br>4.01 -<br>5.0:1 | F<br>5.01 -<br>7.0:1 | G<br>>7.0:1 |
| <u>In-State</u>       |                                                                       |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |             |
| ARL                   | 13%                                                                   | 6%                   | -                    | 2%                   | -                    | 7%                   | 1%          |
| Other Academic        | 6%                                                                    | 6%                   | 34%                  | 23%                  | 12%                  | 16%                  | 10%         |
| With Graduate Program | -                                                                     | 2%                   | 4%                   | 5%                   | 12%                  | 5%                   | 20%         |
| Undergraduate Only    | -                                                                     | -                    | 10%                  | 11%                  | 7%                   | 4%                   | 6%          |
| Public                | -                                                                     | -                    | 7%                   | 8%                   | 2%                   | 2%                   | 3%          |
| Government Research   | 21%                                                                   | 8%                   | 1%                   | 28%                  | 3%                   | 7%                   | 8%          |
| Special               |                                                                       |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |             |
| Total In-State        | 40%                                                                   | 22%                  | 56%                  | 77%                  | 36%                  | 41%                  | 48%         |
| <u>Out-of-State</u>   |                                                                       |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |             |
| ARL                   | 50%                                                                   | 38%                  | 15%                  | 8%                   | 18%                  | 19%                  | 18%         |
| Other Academic        | 9%                                                                    | 34%                  | 22%                  | 12%                  | 39%                  | 24%                  | 22%         |
| With Graduate Program | -                                                                     | 2%                   | 1%                   | 1%                   | 3%                   | 1%                   | 2%          |
| Undergraduate Only    | -                                                                     | 1%                   | 5%                   | 1%                   | 1%                   | 2%                   | 5%          |
| Public                | 1%                                                                    | 1%                   | 1%                   | -                    | 1%                   | 2%                   | 5%          |
| Government Research   | -                                                                     | 2%                   | -                    | 1%                   | 2%                   | 11%                  | 3%          |
| Special               |                                                                       |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |             |
| Total Out-of-State    | 60%                                                                   | 78%                  | 44%                  | 23%                  | 64%                  | 59%                  | 52%         |
| Total                 | 100%                                                                  | 100%                 | 100%                 | 100%                 | 100%                 | 100%                 | 100%        |



Table 7 shows the wide range in the percentage of loans which are made to network or consortia members -- from 0 percent to 48 percent. The range is also wide in the percentage of loans which are made to ARL libraries outside of network or consortia arrangements. Two of the private academic libraries make about one-half of their ILL loans to ARL members outside of any consortia arrangement.

As revealed by the data in Table 8, there is also substantial variation among the seven libraries in the proportion of their lending to out-of-state ARL libraries. At one extreme, one-half of the lending from one library goes to out-of-state ARL libraries (63 percent including ARL libraries in-state) compared to one library which only lent eight percent to out-of-state ARL libraries (10 percent including in-state). It appears that the smaller the lending/borrowing ratio, the greater the proportion of loans to ARL libraries. The library with a high lending/borrowing ratio (e.g., 7 to 1) lends to a much higher proportion of non-ARL libraries. The three libraries with the highest proportion of lending to ARL libraries (63 percent, 44 percent, and 26 percent) are all private academic libraries.

Most of the lending by the seven libraries is to academic libraries. Over three-fourths of the loans for four of the libraries are to academic libraries. Only one library (Library D) makes as low as 50 percent of its loans to academic libraries.

Except for Library F which makes 11 percent of its loans to out-of-state special libraries, no library lends more than five percent to any out-of-state category of public, government, or special libraries. There is more variability in the in-state lending to these three kinds of nonacademic libraries.

Overall, except for Library D which provides 77 percent of its loans to in-state libraries, the libraries make only about one-half of their loans to in-state libraries. In one case, Library B, only 22 percent of the loans are in-state. This suggests that the problem of reimbursement for the costs of lending cannot be met solely by in-state subsidization of the lending within a state.

#### 4.4 Attitudes on Lending to Different Types of Libraries

Data for the entire sample of libraries surveyed about their attitudes toward lending to various types of libraries are presented in Table 9. Regardless of whether each answering library was a net lender or net borrower, they were virtually unanimous in their belief that they are obliged to serve or feel that they are willing to serve four categories of libraries: co-members of networks or consortia, ARL libraries, libraries serving graduate programs, and government research libraries. Only slightly more than half of the libraries surveyed believed they were obliged or willing to serve libraries serving only undergraduate programs or public libraries. Over 90 percent of the net borrowing libraries also feel obliged or willing to serve special libraries; in contrast, this view was shared by only 76 percent of the net lenders. A higher proportion of net lenders also prefers to serve only special libraries or undergraduate libraries in the state.

However, differences between attitudes of obligation to serve and willingness to serve are striking. For the net borrowers, the only category they feel obliged to serve are co-members of a network or consortia (79 percent) even though they borrow more than they lend. The implication is obvious -- even the net borrowers could potentially want to be reimbursed for lending activity since they do not feel an obligation to most

Table 9. Attitudes of net borrowers and net lenders about lending to different types of libraries

| Type of Library Requesting Loan | Number of Libraries Responding* | Attitudes of Net Borrowers  |                           |                            |                                        |                           |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                                 |                                 | Obligated to Serve (Col. 1) | Willing to Serve (Col. 2) | Subtotal (Col. 1 + Col. 2) | Prefer to Serve In-State Only (Col. 4) | Should Not Serve (Col. 5) |
| Members of Network/Consortia    | 29                              | 79%                         | 21%                       | 100%                       | -                                      | -                         |
| ARL Libraries                   | 30                              | 27%                         | 73%                       | 100%                       | -                                      | -                         |
| Academic Libraries              | 32                              | 12%                         | 50%                       | 62%                        | 16%                                    | 22%                       |
| Undergraduates Only             | 32                              | 38%                         | 59%                       | 97%                        | 3%                                     | -                         |
| Graduate Programs               | 32                              | 9%                          | 44%                       | 50%                        | 38%                                    | 9%                        |
| Public Libraries                | 32                              | 19%                         | 75%                       | 94%                        | 6%                                     | -                         |
| Government Research Libraries   | 32                              | 12%                         | 81%                       | 93%                        | 6%                                     | -                         |
| Special Libraries               | 32                              | 15%                         | 56%                       | 71%                        | 21%                                    | 9%                        |
| Any Library                     | 34                              |                             |                           |                            |                                        |                           |

  

|                               | Number of Libraries Responding* | Attitudes of Net Lenders    |                           |                            |                                        |                           |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                               |                                 | Obligated to Serve (Col. 1) | Willing to Serve (Col. 2) | Subtotal (Col. 1 + Col. 2) | Prefer to Serve In-State Only (Col. 4) | Should Not Serve (Col. 5) |
| Members of Network/Consortia  | 85                              | 94%                         | 6%                        | 100%                       | -                                      | -                         |
| ARL Libraries                 | 88                              | 60%                         | 40%                       | 100%                       | -                                      | -                         |
| Academic Libraries            | 84                              | 20%                         | 38%                       | 57%                        | 30%                                    | 22%                       |
| Undergraduates Only           | 91                              | 49%                         | 51%                       | 98%                        | -                                      | -                         |
| Graduate Programs             | 87                              | 17%                         | 42%                       | 58%                        | 36%                                    | 9%                        |
| Public Libraries              | 88                              | 36%                         | 61%                       | 97%                        | 2%                                     | -                         |
| Government Research Libraries | 89                              | 21%                         | 57%                       | 76%                        | 20%                                    | -                         |
| Special Libraries             | 90                              | 13%                         | 48%                       | 61%                        | 23%                                    | 9%                        |
| Any Library                   |                                 |                             |                           |                            |                                        |                           |

\* Not all libraries responded to all questions.

libraries. Reflecting the situation as it presently is, a higher proportion of net lending libraries do feel obliged to serve all categories of libraries. The most striking contrast with the net borrowers is in their attitude toward ARL libraries -- 60 percent of the net lenders feel obliged to serve this category compared to 27 percent of the net borrowers.<sup>8</sup> For both net lenders and net borrowers, the data strongly suggest that ILL activity is, in large part, done not out of a sense of obligation but a willingness to serve, which, in difficult times, may not be sufficient to sustain the effort.

To attempt to assess librarian attitudes about reimbursement for the expense of ILL, we asked what types of borrowing libraries, if any, should be charged. The results in Table 10 indicate that out-of-state special libraries are the favorite

Table 10. Types of libraries which should pay for interlibrary loan\* (in-state and out-of-state)

| Type of Borrowing Library           | Percent of Reporting Librarians Feeling Compensation Should be Received For: |                           |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                                     | In-State Transactions                                                        | Out-of-State Transactions |
| Special Libraries                   | 41                                                                           | 58                        |
| Public Libraries                    | 22                                                                           | 41                        |
| Academic Libraries (undergrad only) | 17                                                                           | 31                        |
| Government Research Libraries       | 15                                                                           | 25                        |
| Academic Libraries (grad programs)  | 10                                                                           | 22                        |
| ARL Libraries                       | 7                                                                            | 14                        |
| Member Network/Consortia            | 10                                                                           | 5                         |

\* N = 59 libraries which reported opinion that some compensation should be received for interlibrary lending.

<sup>8</sup> This may be explained by the fact that most of the net lenders are ARL libraries.



target for reimbursement by those librarians who favor the idea of compensation. As shown in Table 11, the librarians favored compensation 1) in some cases, 2) to net lenders, or 3) in all cases. It should be noted that the notion of compensation does not necessarily require the payment of fees.

#### 4.5 Summary

In analyzing the table presented above, it becomes clear that an imbalance in ILL load does in fact exist, and that certain libraries are bearing a disproportionate amount of the traffic. The profile of a typical "burdened" library that emerges is of a large library, holding 500,000 or more volumes, which is a member of ARL. The library receives 3,000 or more loan requests a year, lends more than it borrows and has a high lending/borrowing ratio, and is more apt than other libraries to perceive ILL as a burden. It is these libraries in particular for which a proposed payment system will attempt to provide financial relief.

From a sample of seven net lending libraries, no clear pattern of libraries to which loans are made emerges. Great variability exists within types of libraries served and in-state and out-of-state loans. This suggests that libraries must consider, on an individual basis, those specific libraries and types of libraries they will charge and the degree of financial relief this will provide.



Table 11. Directors: attitude on compensation of lending in academic libraries, by collection size of responding library

| Attitude on Compensation                                                                            | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                   |                  |                   |               |                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                                                                                     | 20,000 - 99,000                       | 100,000 - 499,999 | 500,000 and Over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries | Total Respondents |
| Academic libraries should <u>not</u> be compensated                                                 | 44%                                   | 31%               | 20%              | -                 | 24%           | 37                |
| Only privately funded libraries should be compensated                                               | -                                     | 7%                | 2%               | -                 | 2%            | 4                 |
| Compensation should be received if loan requests exceed borrowing requests sent to the same library | 12%                                   | 21%               | 18%              | 30%               | 18%           | 29                |
| Compensation should be received in <u>all</u> cases                                                 | -                                     | 17%               | 12%              | 30%               | 13%           | 20                |
| Compensation should be received in <u>some</u> cases                                                | 44%                                   | 24%               | 48%              | 30%               | 42%           | 66                |
| Don't Know                                                                                          | -                                     | -                 | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| No Answer                                                                                           | -                                     | -                 | -                | 10%               | 1%            | 1                 |
| Total                                                                                               | 100%                                  | 100%              | 100%             | 100%              | 100%          | 157               |

## 5. GOALS AND CRITERIA

### 5.1 Criteria for Evaluating Alternatives

We were aware that any method to reimburse the large net lending libraries would be viewed as controversial by many in the library community. As we struggled with developing an explicit statement of the goals and objectives of the various alternatives which have been proposed, we identified 15 criteria which any proposed alternative should meet if it is to satisfy all segments of the library community. These criteria can be grouped into six clusters:

#### Simple

1. Must be easy to implement (begin)
2. Must be easy to use over time

#### Aid to Lenders

3. Must offer immediate improvement for large net lenders
4. Should place increased responsibility on the borrower
5. Should relate income to the library's lending/borrowing ratio

#### Access and Use

6. Should not reduce present levels of use
7. Access to the system should be maintained and eventually improved

#### Efficiency

8. Should increase speed of access to publicly available materials

9. Should reduce the average service cost per ILL transaction
10. Should increase the likelihood that the value of the transaction will be worth the cost
11. Should relate income from ILL to performance and dependability

#### State and Regional Resources

12. State and regional systems of ILL cooperation should be fully utilized and further developed
13. Should increase the use of regional and state resources and decrease "unnecessary" borrowing at the national level
14. Borrowing libraries should use available material and resources to find in-state and regional locations first

#### Evaluation

15. Must provide for monitoring of the system to improve the configuration.

Goals 12 through 14 are a recognition of the reality that obligations and financial support often coincide with state and regional jurisdictions. No state can or should be completely self-sufficient, but measures which strengthen state systems are an effective means of improving ILL. The formation of multi-state regions for library cooperation can provide similar advantages.

### 5.2 Major Goals

We were also aware that no proposed alternative would perfectly meet all of the 15 criteria for an improved ILL system. The focus of the study upon improving the financial arrangements

of the ILL system, particularly our focus on the imbalance in lending and borrowing as described in the preceding chapter, led us to formulate one primary goal which any alternative should meet: to provide relief to those libraries which carry a substantial ILL load.

As described earlier, we realize that this study and its recommended alternatives for cost sharing must address the immediate problem with short-term solutions, since pressures on the large lenders require attention now. The solution prescribed, however, must not conflict with possible long-term improvement of the transfer of knowledge between libraries and their users. Furthermore, work on a long-term solution, such as the proposals to develop a National Periodical Resources Plan and the System for Interlibrary Communication and the national program proposed by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, must continue if all of the problems of ILL are to be addressed.

## 6. ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO FINANCING ILL

### 6.1 Selection of Alternatives

A number of alternative approaches were considered to meet the primary goal of providing relief to those libraries that carry a substantial ILL load. We especially considered solutions that included policies, internal and external financial modifications, and organizational and resource development. Eight alternatives were identified:

1. Restricted lending by large net lenders
2. Charge net borrowers
3. Charge all borrowing libraries
4. Subsidize net lenders
5. Subsidize all lenders
6. Regional screening, bibliographic centers, location tools
7. Augmentation of existing regional/national centers
8. National Periodical Resources Plan, new institutions such as service bureaus, SILC (System for Interlibrary Communication).

Alternative 1, which encourages net lenders to restrict their lending, would accomplish the goal of providing relief, and has in fact already been initiated by some libraries. One library fills only those requests which they judge could not be filled by a resource library closer to the requesting library, others restrict the types of libraries to which they will lend, and still others restrict lending more subtly by such measures as slowing down the turnaround time. Another policy which could be adopted would be to refuse to lend until evidence is furnished that the



borrowing library attempted to obtain the needed material from local or regional resources. The difficulty with the restriction of lending by net lenders, however, is that access would be severely limited and that levels of use would decrease. While some of the materials provided by ILL are held by libraries other than the net lenders, others are unique to these collections and could not be obtained elsewhere. Because restricted lending policies would necessarily have detrimental effects on our access and use criteria, it was discarded as a possible alternative.

Alternatives 6, 7, and 8, which propose new regional and national arrangements, offer great promise as long-range solutions for the redistribution of ILL; they were, however, judged to be beyond the scope of the present study.

Four alternative solutions to the immediate problem remain for consideration:

1. Charge net borrowers
2. Charge all borrowers
3. Subsidize net lenders
4. Subsidize all lenders.

## 6.2 Subsidy Alternatives

The dilemma of ILL is that those institutions which need it the most have the least amount of money. According to some leaders in the field, federal and state subsidies are required. Alphonse Trezza, State Librarian of Illinois has said:

"From my experience at ALA and in Illinois, it is clear that cooperation is only going to work with federal and state support. The local units

cannot afford to carry the burden alone. If inter-library loan were a core service they would have to do it. But it isn't. If I were doing 5 to 10 percent of my circulation as interlibrary loan I could not maintain that it was important. Yet it is important because those using the service are most likely the highly specialized clientele and the library is compelled to serve them."<sup>9</sup>

The state subsidy in Illinois works in the following way:

"We pay the University of Illinois, Chicago Public Library, and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, plus the state library, on a formula grant as resource centers. They receive a basic grant of \$40,000 that can be used in any manner they see fit: for staff, books, equipment. We don't care how they use it. Then they receive a fee for every time they receive and search something and an additional fee if they fulfill a request. They are, then, getting paid for what they do. You have some accountability. The institution that provides the most service receives the most money."<sup>10</sup>

The difficulty with the subsidy alternatives is that they are not immediately implementable. Instead, subsidy of ILL could support or supplant the existing financial arrangements, probably within a state system and/or within a national system of specialized libraries.

Such a subsidy might increase the ILL load in terms of lending volume on the net lenders or resource libraries, but would reduce the economic burden. State subsidies would increase the

---

<sup>9</sup> "Outlook: Alphonse Trezza - State Agency Iron Duke," Library Journal 4:8:477-8 (September 1973).

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

proportion of borrowing from state and regional resources and decrease the proportion of borrowing from national (nonsubsidized) resources.

Implementation of subsidies depends, of course, on the cooperation of subsidizing agencies, and proposals made to such agencies should include detailed studies of the burden placed on the libraries requesting subsidy and the costs of ILL loans made.

Subsidizing net lenders might take the form of a flat grant, per transaction fee, or some combination of the two to resource libraries within the subsidized system. Indications are that this would increase the demand on the resource libraries, thus creating further imbalance in the distribution of requests made and intensifying the requirement for adequate compensation, financial and otherwise.

One precedent for the reimbursement of net lenders is the system in the State of Ohio where the state library reimburses 33 libraries in the state which have lent more materials to the state library than they received from the state library. The state library receives requests from public libraries and refers to the union catalog of the network of 33 libraries to find a location for all requests which it cannot fill. The state library at the end of the year calculates the number of net transactions and reimburses the net lending libraries at the rate of \$2 per net transaction.

Subsidizing of all borrowing libraries could be implemented if lending libraries charged fees. A subsidizing agency would pay the fee for the borrowing library. This would place the burden of applying for subsidy on the borrowing library and thus probably reduce the demand on the net lenders somewhat, but

does not have the possibilities for long-term improvement of resources provided by direct subsidy to lending libraries.

A number of librarians contacted during the study believed that charges for ILL were inevitable, but that the need for them pointed to a clear role for the federal government to equalize access to materials by providing subsidies to the libraries which needed to go across state lines to obtain material. The role of national subsidies should be carefully considered in long-range planning for an improved ILL system.

### 6.3 Charging Net Borrowers

Briefly, charging net borrowers would involve a periodic evaluation of the difference between a library's lending and borrowing, at which time the library would remit or request payment depending on whether it was a net borrower or net lender. Evaluation could be made in terms of the relationship between two individual libraries, or, if some central clearinghouse(s) existed, within a group or system of libraries. Other variations would include membership fees in an ILL system based to a large extent on previous borrowing and lending volume.

This system would compensate net lenders for lending, and provide for net borrowers to share in the costs of loans made to them. It would effect some redistribution of the ILL load by encouraging libraries to borrow from those libraries or systems to which they lent. However, if this alternative were implemented on an individual library basis, excessive recordkeeping would be required on the part of all participating libraries (with a degree of uniformity not currently practiced). Moreover, it would be difficult to predict total costs for ILL and thus to pass costs

on to the user or to prepare budget estimates. Using a clearing-house would require the formation of a fairly extensive central operation (such as the proposed SILC network). It would also require the cooperation of net borrowers who might well be reluctant to join, thus jeopardizing both the effectiveness of the solution and the access of borrowers to information.

#### 6.4 Charging All Borrowers

Charging all borrowers could be done on an individual transaction or periodic basis, with the amount charged based on a flat or variable fee schedule. Again, net lenders would be reimbursed for lending and borrowers would share in the lending costs. Some ILL traffic would be redistributed from charging libraries to noncharging libraries; there is also the possibility of reduced overall demand particularly as the number of charging libraries increased.

Minimal recordkeeping would be required if charging were done on an individual transaction basis, thus reducing the burden on the lending library. This must be balanced against the cost to the borrowing library of remitting payment. Periodic billing would require added records on the part of both libraries involved, but only one bill and payment per period. Minimum effort and cost would seem to be required in a system which incorporated billing and payment in already established ILL procedures (per transaction) without further recordkeeping, and at the same time minimized the number of cash outlays made by the borrowing library. A coupon system fits these specifications.



Considering the primary evaluation criteria of immediate improvement, ease of implementation and use, and economic relief for large net lenders (those most directly related to relief of the burden on large net lenders), the solution which best meets the goal of providing relief for those libraries carrying a substantial ILL load is to charge all borrowers. Four optional systems for charging all borrowers are described in the next chapter after the variables involved are discussed; each system presented is feasible under the evaluation criteria. A decision to select one of them must be made subjectively, based on the perceived merits and anticipated effects of each. No clear consensus has emerged on this point from our survey of library directors and ILL librarians or from additional interviews.

While subsidies are not immediately implementable and thus are not presented as a short-term solution, they are recommended as a second stage to support or supplant a fee system if one is introduced.

## 7. FEE SYSTEM OPTIONS

### 7.1 Magnitude of Fees for Monograph Loans

An important variable in the consideration of fee system options is the magnitude of the fee charged. Possibilities we will consider include uniform charges, both those providing cost recovery and token compensation, and variable charges set by the individual libraries. Also discussed will be the possibility of charging not only for filled requests but also for the service performed in searching for a request which is not filled. Only charges for monograph loans will be treated here, with fees for photocopies, microforms, and other materials covered in Section 7.5.

Librarians surveyed stressed the importance of a uniform fee system for simplifying the process of charging. Several complained that with current variable photocopying fees, they did not know initially or from one time to the next what the lending library would charge. The time and cost of finding out this information and recontacting the patron to see if he or she wished to initiate the request was perceived as a nuisance which a uniform national fee would eliminate. A standard charge is also seen as one which could most readily be accompanied by standard procedures and thus would require a minimum amount of effort on the part of an individual library in establishing and administering ILL charges.

#### 7.1.1 Uniform Fee for Full Compensation

One level of a uniform charge is based on the average cost to the lending library for a loan transaction that is a

completed loan request. A request is identified with a request form for a title, and may represent more than one volume. According to Westat's 1971 ILL study,<sup>11</sup> the cost for a loan transaction calculated from data on 12 large academic libraries was \$5.82.<sup>12</sup> Adding an inflation factor of five percent per year results in a cost estimate for 1974 of approximately \$7.00 per loan transaction, and this is the amount suggested for monograph loans in a uniform cost recovery fee system.

It should be noted that this figure distributes all lending costs over the filled requests, and so is applicable only if searching for requests which are not filled is not charged for directly. Different charges for filled and unfilled requests will be discussed later in this section.

The advantage of a cost recovery fee system is, of course, that it recovers costs; that is, the lending library is compensated for the service it provides outside its primary clientele group, and the borrowing library assumes the cost of providing materials from other libraries to its users. Calculating costs on an average basis is simpler than determining individual costs for each participating library and, in addition, benefits those libraries with more efficient interlibrary loan departments.

---

<sup>11</sup> Palmour, Vernon E., et. al. Op. cit., 1972.

<sup>12</sup> Analysis of the 1971 data (Ibid.) to separate costs for original and photocopy loans showed originals costing \$5.07, photocopies \$6.72, and an average cost of \$5.82. These figures do not take into account potential benefit to the lending library from having the original of a photocopied item remain in the collection rather than be out on loan for a period of some time. This factor, along with a requirement for simplicity of charges, gave rise to the selection of the average price -- \$5.82 -- as the base for the suggested charge associated with both originals and photocopies.

### 7.1.2 Uniform Partial Cost Recovery Fee

The second type of uniform fee provides token compensation for loans made. This provides some relief to lending libraries bearing a financial burden but does not recover full costs; rather it attempts to balance a response to budget costs with the felt obligation of many librarians to support scholarship and share resources. The amount selected for a partial cost recover fee is somewhat arbitrary but out choice -- \$3.50 -- retains the idea of compromise; it is low enough so as to avoid significantly limiting access but high enough to justify its collection and provide some compensation. It is one-half the suggested full cost recovery fee.

With regard to the impact of a partial cost recovery fee system, it is clear that any system of charges will cause the person or institution paying it to reevaluate the worth of the material requested. A possible danger associated with a partial cost recovery charge is that the value of a loan transaction will thus be underestimated. Similarly, it has been suggested that adequate levels of subsidization may be jeopardized by the establishment of such a fee.

### 7.1.3 Variable Cost Recovery Fee

Another fee schedule considered is a variable one based on individual library costs, resulting in different charges for each lending library. The major advantage of such a variable fee schedule lies in its flexibility; charges based on actual costs allow each lending library to recover expenses incurred. Also, libraries may choose to discourage or promote use of their library



as an ILL resource by the fee schedule they set. Thus redistribution could be effected away from libraries unwilling to make materials available beyond their primary clientele.

A variable fee system for monographs has many of the disadvantages of the current variable system for photocopies. Both the borrowing and lending library must involve themselves in additional correspondence to establish the current charge for a transaction, a problem which is complicated by the tendency of some borrowing libraries to "shop" for a bargain price. The cost, in a variable fee system, might become a major determinant in the selection of a source library for a request, resulting in additional time delays if that library does not hold the material.

#### 7.1.4      Distinguishing Fees by Service Provided

For each of the three types of fees discussed, it would be possible to distinguish different costs for various services provided -- for example, for completing or correcting a citation, for searching, and for providing the material. This is done currently by the Regional Information and Communication Exchange (RICE) as well as a few other information services. The simplest schedule of this sort distinguishes between filled and unfilled requests, charging one amount for searching and an additional sum for filling the request. This is the pattern of compensation in the Illinois and New York State systems.

The purpose of such a schedule is two-fold, to charge for services provided and to discourage librarians from making requests which cannot be filled. A variation of this does not charge when the material is owned but not available, but only when the lending library does not own the material, in effect



levying a charge for insufficient work in identifying an appropriate location. Due to current inadequacies in bibliographic tools, however, accurate verification is frequently not possible. For this reason it is not suggested that charges be made for unfilled requests.

An additional factor arguing against the establishment of different charges for filled and unfilled requests is the usual market procedure for charging only for services or products provided, adding overhead costs for unfilled requests to the actual costs. In the case of interlibrary loan, the service requested is not bibliographic verification but document delivery and if this service is not provided no charge should be made.

Finally, the point should be made that each additional fee added to a system requires additional bookkeeping effort on the part of both borrowing and lending libraries, and correspondingly detracts from the desired simplicity.

## 7.2 Libraries Charging Fees

While recognizing that each individual library will ultimately determine whether or not it will adopt a fee system, we will explore the possibilities of certain groups of libraries charging to determine the resultant impact.

The simplest possibility is that all lending libraries will charge, unless they are otherwise directly compensated for their ILL services. This is most consistent with the concept of a cost recovery fee system, either uniform or variable, in that each library providing services outside its primary clientele group would be fully compensated for them.

Considering the goal, however, of providing relief to those libraries which carry a substantial ILL load, another possibility is that only net lenders charge for ILL initially and that other libraries charge reciprocally; that is, they charge only the net lenders. This could be instituted with a token fee system and would serve to provide some compensation to, and possibly otherwise relieve the burden on, net lenders. While it is not known what percentage of loans, if any, made by large net lenders could be filled elsewhere in the ILL system, indications are that the percentage is substantial enough to warrant an attempt to redistribute traffic to other lending libraries. It is recognized that if a fee system is initiated, eventually all libraries will charge, but initial charging only by net lenders would provide at least a temporary solution to the current inequities of ILL. It does not address the problem of full compensation to all libraries providing ILL but leaves this for other methods of solution such as subsidy.

### 7.3 Method of Payment

The methods of billing, collection, and payment considered most feasible are coupon, credit card, and clearinghouse.

An essential element of each of these is a central agency handling some portion of the billing and collection procedures, thus providing that transfer of funds be made in periodic amounts rather than on an individual transaction basis, and that a minimum amount of additional work be done by the libraries involved.

### 7.3.1 Coupons

Coupons could be supplied by a central clearinghouse and sold on demand. Borrowing libraries making requests would send the appropriate coupon(s) with their requests, and the lending library would keep the coupon if the request was filled or return it if the request was unfilled. Coupons acquired by lending libraries could be used to borrow materials or be redeemed through the clearinghouse.

Using coupons eliminates additional recordkeeping on the part of both lending and borrowing libraries, requiring perhaps only a notation of amount sent on the request form. The lending library does not need to prepare an invoice, and the borrowing library does not need to process and send a check. Multiple use of a single coupon reduces accounting and service costs for the clearinghouse.

In some libraries, accounting procedures may prohibit the purchase or use of coupons. Where these procedures cannot be suitably modified, the clearinghouse might, for a service charge, provide the library with coupons that could be paid for after they were used. Another alternative for these libraries would be to pay the lending libraries for loans directly without the use of coupons.

A coupon system was used successfully by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) for uniform prices but was discontinued after variable pricing was introduced and handling of multiple coupons became unwieldy. This points out a requirement that a coupon system be used only if the fee schedule allows for a minimum number of charges. It is also necessary, with more than one source providing loans, that charges be uniform over all libraries so that the same coupons can be used by all and correspondence concerning the charges can be eliminated.

For the above reasons coupons are suggested for either of two uniform fee systems, one in which all libraries charge cost recovery fees and one in which the net lending libraries charge token fees.

### 7.3.2 Credit Cards

A credit card system would again require a clearinghouse, reasonably one of the already established credit card firms such as American Express. The NTIS has recently introduced the use of American Express credit cards for its information services, expecting this to be of particular value in dealing with foreign customers.

In a credit card system, borrowing libraries would include their credit card numbers with their requests and, if a loan was made, duplicate copies of a charge record form would be held by the lending and borrowing libraries and the credit card company. All billing would be done by this company on a periodic basis, with transactions within the period itemized on one bill. This would eliminate the billing process for the lending library and simplify payment for the borrowing library.

The use of an already established credit card firm as a clearinghouse would permit rapid implementation of a fee system. On the other hand, the introduction of such a third party into the sometimes complex interlibrary loan process might result in unnecessary complication and require procedures outside the standard services offered.

From both the point of view of the credit card company and the libraries involved, a credit card system is justified only if the charge per transaction is sufficiently high so that the

company's percentage charge covers their costs and that the income to the library after these charges have been deducted is still significant. Thus, a credit card system is suggested for full cost recovery fee systems, both uniform and variable. It has a particular advantage in a variable fee system, in that a borrowing library need not know the exact charge when making a request but only provide their credit card number and authorize an upper limit. This advantage might be offset by the reluctance to request a loan which would be filled for an unknown cost.

### 7.3.3 SILC

A third method of collection would use a central clearinghouse handling all ILL communications and preparing bills for ILL transactions in much the same way as a credit card system would. The proposed SILC (System for Interlibrary Communication) system could perform this function with numerous advantages over coupon and credit card systems, providing the borrowing library with information on fees via teletype and removing from the lending library the necessity of preparing additional forms, while still providing periodic itemized records of transactions made and charges due or incurred. Again, however, we return to the scope of our study, which limits us to quickly implementable systems. This causes us to eliminate SILC from the alternatives. It should be noted that were SILC implemented, either a coupon or credit card system of fees could be readily converted to its use.

## 7.4 Description of Optional Systems

Combining the suggested variations of the last three sections on magnitude of fees, libraries charging, and method of



payment results in four total system options to an interlibrary loan fee system. These are shown in Figure 2 and described below.

Figure 2. Fee System Options

| <u>System Number</u> | <u>Magnitude of Fees</u>         | <u>Libraries Charging</u>    | <u>Payment Method</u> |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| I                    | Full Cost<br>Recovery Uniform    | All Participating            | Coupon                |
| II                   | Full Cost<br>Recovery Uniform    | All Participating            | Credit Card           |
| III                  | Partial Cost<br>Recovery Uniform | Participating<br>Net Lenders | Coupon                |
| IV                   | Full Cost<br>Recovery Variable   | All Participating            | Credit Card           |

#### 7.4.1 Fee System I

Were the first alternative fee system to be adopted, all libraries would charge uniform fees designed to recover average costs. Payment by the borrowing library would be by coupons valued at \$7.00, sold by a central clearinghouse.

Borrowing libraries making mail requests would send the appropriate coupon with each request form. Coupons for phone requests could be sent with the confirming request form; and libraries making requests by teletype would send a coupon when returning the loan or make some prior arrangement for reciprocal borrowing, a deposit account, or the like. Transmitting a coupon with each request eliminates most additional recordkeeping on the part of both the lending and borrowing libraries.

Lending libraries would retain the coupon for each filled request and return coupons for unfilled requests. No additional correspondence would be necessary.

Libraries could use all coupons in their possession over and over again, as long as the coupons remained in good condition. This multiple use of coupons would assure that the present reciprocal relationship of free borrowing and free lending could be maintained when desired without resorting to any bookkeeping whatever, and without any money changing hands.

Semi-annually, libraries with an excess of coupons would redeem them through the clearinghouse. At the same time, worn out coupons could be sent in for replacement.

All libraries making interlibrary loans could charge fees, basing their decision on whether to adopt a fee system or not on the expected return balanced with possible detrimental effects on access to information.

It is anticipated that initially only a few libraries might charge, but that within time all would. This, combined with the cost recovery fee, would serve to put ILL services on a sound economic basis. It would diminish the concept of favor which is incorporated in the current system, increasing the borrowing library's right to obtain loans based on the charge paid. Since the material might be needed by the lending library's primary users, however, ILL would continue to be at the discretion of the lending library and to some extent a "favor."

Exceptions to the fee system should be made on a limited basis, in the case of mutual agreement between two individual libraries or of existing systems of ILL in which compensation is

already received. As additional state and regional networks are developed, fees paid among the member libraries could be replaced by some form of system compensation.

The clearinghouse need only be a small operation, with the functions of printing, selling, and redeeming coupons. Some audit checking procedures would be required to guard against fraudulent redemptions. It is anticipated that the number of coupons purchased in the first half-year might be 200,000, of which 100,000 would be redeemed at the close of the period, leaving 100,000 coupons times \$7.00 or \$700,000 cash reserves. In subsequent periods the number of coupons purchased should be slightly greater than the number of coupons redeemed, so that an adequate balance would remain to support clearinghouse operations. It is estimated that a staff of one or two would be required.

Initial funding for the clearinghouse should come through ARL, whose member libraries are expected to benefit most significantly from the fee system. It should be incorporated in an existing library or library association such as CRL, ARL, or the Library of Congress.

This system is expected to reduce the number of ILL requests made, in some cases prohibiting necessary access. Those libraries more likely to be able to fill a request, the large net lenders, will experience an increase in the proportion of requests they receive, but of course will be compensated for loans made. The further concentration of ILL activity in the large net lending libraries might also result in the development of more efficient procedures for making loans, benefiting both the lending and borrowing libraries.

#### 7.4.2      Fee System II

The second fee system adheres to the same philosophy as the first option, with participating libraries charging a uniform cost recovery fee, but introduces credit cards as the method of payment. Within this system, there could be several minor variations based on the specific credit card used. The discussion following describes a generalized system.

Borrowing libraries making a request would include with the ILL form their credit card number or, if greater security was desired, a charge form imprinted with the number. The credit card number could be included in mail, phone, or teletype requests; the charge form would have to be handled in the same manner that a coupon would -- that is, sent with the confirming request form for phone requests or remitted according to prior arrangement for teletype requests.

When a request was filled the lending library would prepare or complete the appropriate charge form. One copy could be kept, another returned to the borrowing library with the requested material, and a third sent, on a periodic basis, to the credit card company.

The credit card company would prepare for each library, both borrowing and lending, an itemized statement of transactions and the resulting credit or debit, and handle all financial transactions. Statements prepared could provide various data for analysis of ILL activity. A percentage charge for services would be deducted from the credits of lending libraries.

The credit card system would permit lending libraries to continue their present reciprocal relationship of free borrowing and free lending if they wished by returning the credit card

record without any charge shown on it, in a manner similar to the multiple use of coupons. This option reduces the cost of the credit card system because no money passes through the credit card company for such reciprocal loans.

There are a number of existing credit card companies which could provide the desired services with varying charges up to 7-1/2 percent. These systems could be used as they exist or, in some cases, modified to better serve ILL needs.

The advantages and disadvantages of System II closely parallel those of System I, providing cost recovery to lending libraries but significantly hindering access by borrowing libraries. Comparison of credit card and coupon systems indicates that a credit card system provides additional records and monitoring data at the cost of higher charges and more paperwork. An additional difference is that transfer of funds is not made in the credit card system until after a transaction is completed, while in the coupon system coupons must be purchased in advance.

#### 7.4.3 Fee System III

This system incorporates uniform partial cost recovery fees charged by net lending libraries and payment by coupon. Coupons valued at \$3.50 would be supplied by a central clearinghouse and sold on demand.

As in System I, coupons could be transmitted with request forms, and the lending library would simply retain the coupon for a filled request and return it if the request was not filled. Exceptions should be made on a limited basis as suggested in System I.



Libraries charging fees would include net lenders, that is, those who show a positive difference between the number of loan requests received and the number of borrowing requests made. Individual decisions of libraries in this category on whether to charge would also be based on the volume of loans made and the anticipated effects of charging. It is suggested that libraries that are not net lenders charge only reciprocally, that is, only to those libraries who charge them. This would result in compensation being received in proportion to the amount of ILL load, with heavy lenders receiving the most compensation, moderate lenders less, and light lenders little if any fees. Payment would also be in approximate proportion to borrowing load under this system.

The clearinghouse would operate as outlined in System I, as a self-supporting unit within an existing library or library organization. The number of coupons sold should be somewhat less than that involved in System I since only net lenders are expected to charge. Initial sales (in the first half-year) might reasonably be for 150,000 coupons, with 75,000 redeemed at the close of the period, leaving 75,000 coupons times \$3.50 or \$262,000 cash reserves. In subsequent periods slightly more coupons should be purchased than redeemed, so that an adequate balance would remain to earn interest for support of the clearinghouse. This could be supplemented by a small (1-2 percent) service charge on coupons purchased, if necessary.

From the borrowing library's point of view, this system would limit access somewhat, but not as significantly as a full cost recovery fee would. The mechanics of payment would be quite simple -- the library need only predict the number of coupons required, purchase them periodically, and attach them to request forms. Coupons returned or received could be used to make further requests.

This system would serve to redistribute ILL traffic away from the net lenders, initially to a large extent. As other libraries began to charge, and this seems inevitable, the net lenders would again tend to receive a disproportionate amount of requests for which they would be only partially compensated. This partial compensation, however, may be sufficient to remove the aura of undue burden currently perceived by the net lending libraries.

#### 7.4.4 Fee System IV

The final fee system covered would provide that all libraries charge variable fees, based on costs, and that payment would be made by means of credit card. A credit card system would be particularly advantageous in this case since it would allow charges to be made (up to a specified maximum) without the borrowing library remitting the correct amount with the request.

Under this system, lending libraries would determine individually equitable charges for the ILL services they provide, and notify borrowing libraries of these fees. Borrowing libraries wishing to make a request would, as in System II, include with the ILL form their credit card number or a charge form imprinted with this number. The credit card number could be included in mail, phone, or teletype requests; the charge form would have to be handled in the same manner that a coupon would -- that is, sent with the confirming request form for phone requests or remitted according to prior arrangement for teletype requests. Also included in requests would be a maximum limit for acceptable charges.

When a request was filled, the lending library would prepare or complete the appropriate charge form. One copy would

be kept, another returned to the borrowing library with the material requested, and a third sent, on a periodic basis, to the credit card company.

The credit card company would prepare for each participating library, both lending and borrowing, an itemized statement of transactions and the resulting debit or credit. All financial transactions would be handled by them, with a percentage charge for services deducted from the credits of lending libraries.

Exceptions to the fee system should be made on a limited basis, in the case of mutual agreement between two individual libraries or of existing systems of ILL in which compensation is already received. As additional state and regional networks are developed, fees paid among the member libraries could be replaced by some form of system compensation.

Libraries would determine whether or not to charge based on the anticipated results of their action, and if they chose to charge, would determine an appropriate level of fees. With a small number of libraries charging, demand would shift to other libraries, but as additional libraries instituted fees at varying levels, requests would shift to libraries with the smallest fees. If these libraries were the larger ones (as they would be, presuming economies of scale) new demand could be accommodated and the result would be fewer libraries providing ILL, but with adequate compensation. This could, in effect, put those libraries that so desired into the business of providing ILL as an essential part of their operations, thus resulting in a more cost-effective system.

This system would provide the greatest flexibility of any of the four described, while maintaining the essential characteristics of simplicity and ease of operation. Lending

libraries could determine the fee they would charge based on their own individual costs and the portion of the demand they felt equipped to handle, and charges could be fairly easily modified based on the results of monitoring of the system. Costs could be recovered, and the credit card system would provide booking and billing services for a relatively small fee. Monitoring of the system could also be performed using data provided by the credit card statements.

The flexibility of this system also provides its major disadvantages. It would be more difficult for a library to know the fees charged by libraries they wish to borrow from, and they may be reluctant to borrow without knowing the fee. Variable charges also provide additional complications in determining from which library to borrow.

#### 7.5 Fees for Materials Other Than Monographs

The fee options suggested to this point have been for loans of monographs in original form. There remains a wide variety of other materials, classified by both type and form, which are involved in ILL traffic and must be considered. These include such types of publications as periodicals, theses, pamphlets, government documents and technical reports in original, photocopy, or microform form, as well as photographs, slides, recordings, and other audio-visual materials.

The percentage of loans made in various type-form categories taken from Westat's 1971 ILL study are shown in Table 12.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>Palmour, V. E., et. al. Op. cit., p. 44.



Original monographs and photocopies of periodicals account for 33.1 percent and 39.9 percent, respectively, or a total of 73 percent of all loans. While indications are that the percentage of microform and "other" transactions is increasing, the former two categories still account for the majority of loans made and suggested fees will focus primarily on them.

Table 12. Percentage of ILL loans made by type and form of material (based on 1,940,000 requests)

| Type of Publication | Form of Material |           |           |       | Total  |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|-------|--------|
|                     | Original         | Photocopy | Microform | Other |        |
| Periodical          | 7.3%             | 39.9%     | 0.7%      | 0.1%  | 48.0%  |
| Monograph           | 33.1%            | 1.1%      | 0.2%      | 0.1%  | 34.5%  |
| Thesis/Dissertation | 4.5%             | 0.5%      | 0.5%      | 0.1%  | 5.6%   |
| Other               | 10.4%            | 0.7%      | 0.6%      | 0.3%  | 12.0%  |
| Total               | 55.3%            | 42.2%     | 2.0%      | 0.6%  | 100.1% |

These two categories -- original monographs and photocopies of periodicals -- suggest a second method of classifying ILL transactions, dividing them into loan (with return) and provision (without return) of materials. If an item is to be returned to the lending library, the charge made should cover only the cost of receiving the request, sending the item, follow-up, and handling of the returned item. If the material is to be retained by the borrowing library or the ultimate user, the cost of creating the item should be included while followup and handling of the return is excluded. Suggested charges for these two categories -- materials loaned and materials provided -- are outlined below.



#### 7.5.1 Fees for Materials (Other Than Monographs) Loaned

The fees suggested for materials loaned are those suggested for monograph loans, since the costs incurred per loan will be the same on the average. These fees are summarized as follows.

|                                   |                               |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Uniform full cost recovery fee    | - \$7.00                      |
| Uniform partial cost recovery fee | - \$3.50                      |
| Variable fee                      | - Established by each library |

This charge should be made for each item loaned, with one item defined as whatever is requested on one ILL form as described in the Interlibrary Loan Procedure Manual.

#### 7.5.2 Fees for Materials Provided

Fees for materials provided should be based on the costs of receiving the request and of producing, usually duplicating, and sending the material. Since production costs can vary greatly, different fees should be charged for different forms of material (e.g., microforms and photocopies).

The most common material provided is photocopy, and the charges suggested are:

|                                   |                                                                          |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Uniform full cost recovery fee    | - \$7.00 for the first 20 pages<br>- \$3.00 for each additional 20 pages |
| Uniform partial cost recovery fee | - \$3.50 for the first 10 pages<br>- \$1.50 for each additional 10 pages |
| Variable fee                      | - Established by each library                                            |

The uniform full cost recovery fee given is based on the average cost per lending transaction established in Westat's 1971 study, with an annual inflation rate of 5 percent applied to convert to 1974 costs.<sup>14</sup> While the study averaged photocopy costs regardless of number of pages, the standard practice of charging by page or group of pages is more reflective of costs incurred and is adopted here.

The partial cost recovery fee has been somewhat arbitrarily chosen at one-half the full cost recovery fee to maintain access insofar as possible while providing some compensation for materials provided. It is less than the highest of the current photocopy charges, but well above the mean. The basic charge is the same amount as that suggested for monographs so that only \$1.50 and \$3.50 coupon values would be required.

Charges for materials other than photocopies provided should, in a full cost recovery system, be based on individual library costs rather than an average figure as long as the volume of such transactions remains small. Libraries providing such materials in any quantity have already established schedules of charges which could serve as models. The charge suggested for other materials provided in a partial cost recovery system is the \$3.50 also prescribed for loans and photocopies.

It is recognized that materials provided may in some cases be supplied through a separate photoduplication facility rather than through an ILL department. While it may not always

---

<sup>14</sup> Again, analysis of the 1971 data to separate costs for original and photocopy loans showed originals costing \$5.07, photocopies \$6.72, and an average cost of \$5.82. The average figure is used for both originals and photocopies in the suggested fee schedule.

be feasible in these cases to adopt uniform fees, photoduplication departments are urged to consider the suggested charges and adopt them when possible.

#### 7.6 Anticipated Effects of Fee System Options

Each of the four alternative fee systems suggested meets the stated goal of providing relief to those libraries which carry a substantial interlibrary loan load. Relief is in terms of financial compensation and reduced requests, both in varying degrees depending upon the system selected. Each system is easy to implement and administer, being based on a small scale or already existing clearinghouse and requiring minimal paperwork on the part of the borrowing and lending libraries. In each system, income is received and expenditures are made on a periodic basis rather than for individual transactions, again reducing processing efforts.

It is clear that any levying of fees for interlibrary loan will change the essential character of the service, and that both lending and borrowing libraries will need to reconsider their policies. With a cost recovery fee system, libraries choosing to charge, while instituting a new restriction (the ability to pay) on ILL traffic, may find it possible to reduce or eliminate previous restrictions on the class of user or scope of material loaned. Borrowing libraries -- the ultimate users -- will be forced to reevaluate the worth of an interlibrary loan, basing their decision on a more realistic view of the cost factors involved. These effects will also be present if libraries adopt token fees, although in a more muted form.

While the imposition of fees will provide a barrier to resource sharing in a general sense, it may also lead to the

formalizing of current informal agreements between libraries and the establishing of new consortia within which fees are not charged.

More specific effects of individual fee systems can only be speculative; the number of libraries currently charging is not sufficient to provide an analogy to a large group of libraries charging. It is clear that the institution of fees will cause a decrease in requests made of the charging libraries, presumably a more drastic decrease initially followed by a gradual increase as more libraries begin to charge and the number of noncharging libraries declines. This effect for individual charging libraries will depend to some extent on the uniqueness of the collection; the demand for unduplicated items should decrease less than that for commonly held materials. The imposition of a financial restriction on borrowing will serve to limit both necessary and unnecessary requests.

Based on recent levels of demand, as studied by Westat, it is possible to give some indications of the potential magnitude of funds involved in fees for individual academic libraries. These are presented in Table 13. The figures for borrowing libraries are estimates of the average net expenditures for the five net borrowing libraries in the study that made the greatest number of requests. Similarly, the average income figures for lending libraries are based on the five net lenders receiving the greatest number of requests. Thus, the figures shown give an indication of maximum expenditure -- \$14,000 for System I, \$15,000 for System II, and \$14,000 for System III -- and maximum income -- \$128,000, \$117,000, and \$64,000 for the three systems, respectively. For each system, the net balance for other libraries should fall within the range specified.

Expressing the amounts in this table as percentages of the budgets of the libraries considered, the three systems would

involve 0.7, 0.8, and 0.7 percent, respectively, of the borrowing libraries total budgets and 2.8, 2.5, and 1.4 percent, respectively, of the lending libraries' total budgets. Both the maximum balances and the corresponding percentages of budget would be lessened by decreased demand and also by exceptions made within the fee system.

Table 13. Maximum net balance, ILL fees, for lending and borrowing libraries

| Fee System                                                          | Maximum Net Balance (\$) |                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
|                                                                     | Net Lenders              | Net Borrowers       |
| I. Full cost recovery, uniform; all libraries charge; coupon        | +128,000                 | -14,000             |
| II. Full cost recovery, uniform; all libraries charge; credit card  | +117,000                 | -15,000             |
| III. Partial cost recovery, uniform; net lenders charge; coupons    | + 64,000                 | -14,000             |
| IV. Full cost recovery, variable; all libraries charge; credit card | cannot be estimated      | cannot be estimated |

## 7.7 Evaluation of Options

To aid in our review of the relative merits of each of the four feasible fee system options, we constructed Figure 3 which compares the four options on each of the 15 criteria listed in Chapter 5. The judgments are made in terms of the comparative merits of the options where the available evidence clearly allows such a judgment to be made.



Figure 3. Fee System Options Compared on Criteria\*

| Evaluation Criteria                                                                                                    | Fee System Options                                                |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                                                                                        | I<br>Full Cost<br>Recovery;<br>Uniform;<br>All Charge;<br>Coupons | II<br>Full Cost<br>Recovery;<br>Uniform;<br>All Charge;<br>Credit Card | III<br>Partial Cost<br>Recovery;<br>Uniform;<br>Net Lenders;<br>Coupons | IV<br>Full Cost<br>Recovery;<br>Variable;<br>All Charge;<br>Credit Card |
| <u>Simple</u>                                                                                                          |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| 1. Must be easy to implement (begin)                                                                                   | -                                                                 | +                                                                      | -                                                                       | +                                                                       |
| 2. Must be easy to use over time                                                                                       | +                                                                 | -                                                                      | +                                                                       | -                                                                       |
| <u>Aid to Lenders</u>                                                                                                  |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| 3. Must offer immediate improvement for net lenders                                                                    | +                                                                 | +                                                                      | -                                                                       | +                                                                       |
| 4. Should place increased responsibility on the borrowing library                                                      |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| 5. Should relate income to the library's lending/borrowing ratio                                                       |                                                                   |                                                                        | +                                                                       |                                                                         |
| <u>Access and Use</u>                                                                                                  |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| 6. Should not reduce present levels of use                                                                             |                                                                   |                                                                        | +                                                                       | -                                                                       |
| 7. Access to the system should be maintained and eventually improved                                                   |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| <u>Efficiency</u>                                                                                                      |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| 8. Should increase speed of access to publicly available materials                                                     | +                                                                 | +                                                                      |                                                                         | -                                                                       |
| 9. Should reduce the average cost per ILL transaction                                                                  | +                                                                 | +                                                                      |                                                                         | -                                                                       |
| 10. Should increase the likelihood that the value of the transaction will be worth the cost                            | +                                                                 | +                                                                      |                                                                         | -                                                                       |
| 11. Should relate income from ILL to performance and dependability                                                     | +                                                                 | +                                                                      |                                                                         | -                                                                       |
| <u>State and Regional Resources</u>                                                                                    |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| 12. State and regional systems of ILL cooperation should be fully utilized and further developed                       |                                                                   |                                                                        | +                                                                       |                                                                         |
| 13. Should increase the use of regional and state resources and decrease "unnecessary" borrowing at the national level |                                                                   |                                                                        | +                                                                       |                                                                         |
| 14. Borrowing libraries should use available material and resources to find in-state and regional locations first      |                                                                   |                                                                        | +                                                                       |                                                                         |
| <u>Evaluation</u>                                                                                                      |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |
| 15. Must provide for monitoring of the system to improve the configuration                                             |                                                                   |                                                                        |                                                                         |                                                                         |

\* A plus (+) is given if alternative is judged to be preferable to at least two of the other alternatives; a minus (-) is given if it is judged to be worse than at least two of the other alternatives; no rating indicates that no judgment could be made or that 3 or all of the alternatives are essentially similar on that particular criteria.

### Options I and II

In addition to providing immediate financial relief to the net lenders, the two options which would allow all libraries to be reimbursed a standard fee of \$7.00 for each ILL loan compared favorably with the other options in all four of the efficiency criteria (speed of access, reduced transaction costs, improved cost/value ratio, and reward for performance and dependability). This judgment can be made assuming that a standard fee of \$7.00 would encourage libraries to reduce the direct costs of the ILL departments so that their average transaction costs would be below the \$7.00 national average. There is even the possibility that some competition between libraries would develop, since an efficient ILL department would "make money" under these options. Those developments would increase the efficiency of the ILL loan system.

The choice between a coupon system or a credit card system hinges on the simplicity criteria. A credit card system would be easier to initiate, since participating libraries only need to establish a standard contract with, for example, the American Express Company. Using a coupon system would require developing a new system, with all of the possible obstacles inherent in developing a plan which requires agreement of a number of libraries. However, over time we expect that a coupon would be easier to administer, i.e., would require less paperwork for lending libraries without going through a clearinghouse for each transaction. Also, a credit card system would be more costly.

### Option III

Besides being a coupon system which would be easy to use over time as described above, Option III (\$3.50 partial cost

recovery fee charged by the net lenders) has the principle advantage of being a direct attack on the problem of the imbalance in lending/borrowing ratios. This option encourages only net lenders to charge fees (with reciprocal fees charged to them by all libraries which, in turn, lend to the net lenders) and thus relates income from ILL fees to the lending/borrowing ratio. Compared to the other options, a \$3.50 fee also has the least likelihood of reducing present levels of use of the ILL system. Finally, since only the net lenders will be charging, it is more likely that a borrowing library would make a greater effort to find the needed material within its own state or region (Criteria 12, 13, 14).

#### Option IV

The only advantages of Option IV (all libraries recover actual costs of lending) are that, using a credit card approach, it would be easy to begin and it would meet the objective of providing financial relief to the net lenders. The principle disadvantages are that it is the option which is most likely to reduce the present use of ILL and it will lead to perpetual inefficiency in the ILL system since a library can recover its full costs, regardless of the efficiency of the operation.

Overall, a partial cost recovery fee would seem to be advisable at least in the initial stages of a fee system; this would provide some compensation to charging libraries while not affecting the present system so drastically as would a full cost recovery fee. A partial cost recovery fee would be sufficient to remind libraries that interlibrary lending does in fact have costs associated with it; and as monitoring established the effect of fees, the amount charged could be modified to reflect the desired goals.

Initially it may be those libraries bearing the most substantial portion of the ILL load -- the net lenders -- that choose to charge, since the potential benefit for them is substantial in comparison to the effort involved in implementation. All libraries, however, may institute charging as it becomes advantageous to do so.

A coupon system is the simplest method of collecting fees; it requires little additional paperwork and is less costly than credit cards. Dependence on a central clearinghouse is minimized.

Based on the above analysis, the option selected combines portions of Options I and III to provide for a partial cost recovery fee charged by all participating libraries with payment by coupon.

## 8. THE RECOMMENDED FEE SYSTEM

### 8.1 Description of the Recommended System

Based on analysis of the four optional fee systems, the recommended system incorporates the use of coupons in payment for interlibrary loans made by all participating libraries. The amount of the fee should be set initially at \$3.50, half the full cost recovery figure, and reconsidered annually by a committee representing participating libraries. Upon analysis of monitoring data collected, this committee may find it reasonable to gradually increase the amount of the fee to provide full cost recovery.

The advisory committee should be established upon acceptance of the fee concept, to provide guidance in the implementation of the system to individual libraries. In particular, the committee should set specific guidelines for the determination of libraries or types of libraries to be exempted from charges. These exemptions should be limited, focusing primarily on transactions for which compensation is already received.

### 8.2 Implementation

Implementation of the recommended fee system discussed above will require four general steps:

1. Establishment of the advisory committee.
2. Specification of the clearinghouse and detailed procedures for all libraries participating in the system.



3. Decisions by individual libraries, networks and consortia, state systems, and associations of their posture toward the fee system.
4. Initiation of the fee system by a specified date.

These steps will be discussed below.

#### 8.2.1 Advisory Committee

Upon general acceptance of the fee system concept, an ARL committee should be formed to serve in an advisory capacity. The first task of this committee will be to specify a clearinghouse and to define guidelines for policies and procedures of participating libraries. Included in the guidelines should be a discussion of libraries or types of libraries to be exempted from charges.

A further task of the advisory committee will be to specify the time schedule leading to full implementation of the fee system. This will depend on the response by libraries wishing to initiate charges as well as the amount of time required to set up the clearinghouse. Borrowing libraries should be allowed sufficient time to include funds for ILL charges in their budgets.

When the clearinghouse is operational, the advisory committee will continue to provide guidance to it and to participating libraries, developing modifications to the fee system when necessary. Monitoring data will provide the basis for decisions, which will include annual consideration of the value of the coupons.

As the fee system expands, the committee may choose to add to its membership representatives from non-ARL participating libraries, both lending and borrowing.

#### 8.2.2 Clearinghouse

The clearinghouse could be established as an adjunct operation to any one of several existing institutions such as:

- A research library with an established accounting system for external charges, e.g., John Crerar Library.
- A network or consortia with an established accounting system for external charges, e.g., NYSILL, WILS.
- A multi-library organization, e.g., CRL.
- A national library, i.e., the Library of Congress.
- A library association, e.g., ARL.

ARL should provide overall guidance for the fee system through its committee system, but could contract with one of the above organizations to operate the clearinghouse. Initial support to ARL might be a grant from a foundation or government agency to develop plans for governance and monitoring and to initiate the operation.

If within one of the library organizations, the clearinghouse operation need not be complicated. The staff could begin with one professional in charge, with clerical staff added as the volume of traffic required. The organizational structure used by NTIS or by the various credit card companies will provide a model for setting up the operation. After initial funding, the clearinghouse would be self-sufficient, supporting the operations with interest earned on cash holdings.

Estimated annual income and operating expenses for the clearinghouse are shown in Figure 4. Initial funding is assumed to cover the planning period and the first six months of operation. At the end of the six months, it is anticipated that the clearinghouse would have sold 250,000 coupons and redeemed 125,000, leaving a cash balance of \$437,500. In subsequent periods the number of coupons sold should be slightly greater than the number of coupons redeemed so that a cash balance of at least \$437,500 will remain. With an eight percent return on investment this would provide \$35,000 annual income.

Assuming an annual work load of 5,000 transactions, predominately coupon purchases, expenses can be estimated as shown. Staffing includes one half-time professional person for planning and analysis, and one full-time clerical person, with combined salaries of \$18,000. Benefits and overhead will add 25 percent and 50 percent, respectively, to this figure. Postage costs are based on an average of \$.20 per transaction, and coupon costs are estimated at \$1,800 for 300,000 coupons. Five hundred dollars is included for supplies. Thus, total annual expenses are estimated at \$34,800, allowing the clearinghouse to operate on a self-sufficient basis.

It should be emphasized that clearinghouse income is based on coupon value and the number of coupons sold. Unless a sufficiently high volume of coupons is sold at a given coupon value level, the clearinghouse cannot be financially self-sufficient.

Figure 4. Estimated Annual Income and Operating Expenses for the Clearinghouse

Income

|                                                          |                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 250,000 coupons sold in first six months                 |                  |
| 125,000 coupons sold in each subsequent six-month period |                  |
| 125,000 coupons redeemed at end of each six-month period |                  |
| Cash at end of first six months -- 125,000 coupons       |                  |
|                                                          | x <u>\$3.50</u>  |
|                                                          | \$437,500        |
| Return on investment                                     | <u>8 percent</u> |
| Estimated annual investment income                       | \$ 35,000        |

Expenses

|                                                                |            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Salary (One half-time professional and one full-time clerical) | \$18,000   |
| Benefits                                                       | 4,500      |
| Overhead                                                       | 9,000      |
| Postage                                                        | 1,000      |
| Coupons                                                        | 1,800      |
| Supplies                                                       | <u>500</u> |
|                                                                | \$34,800   |

### 8.2.3 Decisions to Participate

Each individual borrowing library, network or consortium, state system, or association will need to decide whether or not it should adopt the proposed fee plan and, if the decision is positive, to develop the internal procedures required for implementation. This decision process should minimize the negative effects as fees are established and the ILL system changes from a nonmarketable to a marketable transaction. Discussion with persons who would be affected by the decision, particularly university administrators, ILL librarians, accountants, and user advisory committees, could help win acceptance.

From our discussion with a number of librarians, we expect that resistance to the change will be very strong in many libraries. Discussion may change the views of some, but it is likely that many libraries will decide to reject the fee concept in order to avoid a difficult conflict. Over time, if a sufficient number of libraries adopt fees, it is likely that the initial resistance to adopt will be overcome as some of the myths and fears about fees are dispelled. This process might be shortened if libraries choosing to charge automatically remitted a coupon with each borrowing request they made.

A library contemplating fees should remember that borrowing libraries must choose among competing sources for the materials they need. If the costs of ILL service, including costs measured in time delays, greatly exceed the perceived benefit to the borrower, the service will go unused. A basic supply-and-demand balance must be achieved between what is provided and what is sought. The four steps for self-study before fees are established are:

1. Determine who the users are. As in this report, libraries contemplating fees should analyze their



users in terms of in-state/out-of-state, volume of demand, etc., to determine who will be most affected by charges.

2. Decide which of the users, if any, should be excused from the charges. The charging library may determine that in-state or in-region traffic should not be charged, for example.
3. Establish performance criteria. The charging library should establish for itself a set of goals related to turnaround time, notifying requester of items not owned, etc.
4. Determine what changes in the library organization are necessary, if any, to meet the criteria. We expect that, to provide efficient and dependable service, libraries (especially those which are highly decentralized) will need to modify their procedures. To be able to charge fees may require some internal accounting changes, for example.

In the long run, we expect that only those libraries which orient their policies and processes to meeting the needs of other libraries and make a commitment to ILL as an important function in their libraries will be satisfied with their ILL operation, regardless of the fee structure. Even average cost recovery fees will not be large enough to maintain an inefficient ILL operation; probably only those libraries which organize an ILL component that can reduce direct costs close to the level of the fees and that meets rapid turnaround criteria will operate a system which satisfies persons both in and outside of the system.

Before libraries can adopt fees it may be necessary for them to set up a standing fund for ILL which they can pay into and out of without university clearances. At Wayne State, for example, only one signature (by the ILL librarian) is required to pay out for ILL expenses. If such a fund can be set up, this might reduce the number of ILL charges which will be

passed on to the user. That is, if libraries could pay the cost with little red tape, they would do so rather than pass it on to the user.

Some libraries may be reluctant to pass fees on to their users but would still wish the users to know that the library had to pay for the ILL. The libraries in WILS (Wisconsin Interlibrary Loan Service) clearly mark the material passed onto the user: "This material has been paid for by your library."

To encourage efficiency in providing loans, we would encourage some libraries to experiment with linking the payment of the fee to performance. For example, a lending library might set a policy that an ILL transaction would be filled without charge if it is not filled within three working days from the receipt of the request. This would further insure rapid turnaround and give some reassurance to the borrowing library that the lending library would take its request seriously. In turn, the borrowing library might consider not passing the charge on to the user if the transaction is not completed and ready for the user to pick it up within 10 days, for example.

The institution of fees, if coupled with a simple incentive plan for rapid and dependable service, is likely to have a salutary effect on perception of ILL among users and librarians alike.

#### 8.2.4 Starting the Fee System

If the recommended fee system is adopted by ARL, its beginnings should be carefully planned and, ideally, should follow a full and candid discussion about the need for and administration of the system. The starting date for a system

could be postponed until a sufficient number of ARL libraries (a critical mass) register with the proposed clearinghouse their intention to begin charging fees. This number could be set arbitrarily, but half the membership of ARL seems reasonable. Alternatively, an amount of total volumes lent could be established as a minimum and when a sufficient number of libraries with a yearly aggregate lending volume of x have decided to adopt fees, the system could begin.

### 8.3 Monitoring

As the fee system is established it is also essential to establish an information system which will monitor changes in the distribution and financing of the ILL system. The monitoring system should be able to answer the following questions:

1. What is the initial distribution and financing of ILL loans?
2. What is the distribution and financing of ILL loans at the end of six months and one year of the operation of the fee system?
3. What change in the distribution and financing is attributable to the fee system?
4. What forecast change in the distribution and financing is attributable to other factors?
5. What change has occurred that was not anticipated by either forecasts or the fee system?

The monitoring system should meet the following objectives:

1. It should obtain data from a variety of sources on a continuing basis.

2. It should systematically develop tabular data by size of library, by time period, and by funding (private/public) of library.
3. It should report data in a manner which will enable the advisory committee to develop modifications, if any, in the fee system and to assess its impact.

To measure the impact on the ILL load of large net lenders, the monitoring system may, for example, inventory the lending/borrowing ratios of large net lenders, the rate of decrease in the proportion of total ILL filled by large net lenders, the increase in the proportion filled by other libraries, the reduction of increase in overall traffic, and the number of fee transactions.

The operation of the fee system itself and the amount of revenue generated could be measured by the absolute number of fee transactions, total amount collected by class of library, average net amount collected by net lenders, percentage of fee payments which are subsidized, and percentage of fees passed on to the users.

#### 8.4 Concluding Remarks

Although we have recommended a fee system to be considered for implementation, some final comments on this solution are in order. The decision to charge fees that may ultimately recover full costs is viewed as the "best" short-term solution to improve the present interlibrary loan system. The perspective taken in this study was from the individual library manager's viewpoint. A library manager makes decisions that satisfy, primarily, the needs of the parent institution. Consequently, the best solution is of a local nature and provides for recovery of full costs for providing loan services. In the long run

solutions should be focused from a national perspective and may remove the need for a fee system as recommended in this report.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Calkins, Hugh W. "An Information System: An Accountability Theory of Policy Analysis." Paper delivered at the 1972 Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., September 5-9 (Available from University Microfilms).
- Greenwood, William. Decision Theory and Information Systems. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western Publishing Company, 1969.
- Hayes, Robert M. A Study of a System for Interlibrary Communication (SILC). Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, February 1974.
- Kaser, David. "Whither Interlibrary Loan?" College and Research Libraries 33:5:398-402 (September 1972).
- "Outlook: Alphonse Trezza - State Agency Iron Duke." Library Journal 4:8:477-8 (September 1973).
- Palmour, Vernon E., et. al. A Study of the Characteristics, Costs, and Magnitude of Interlibrary Loans in Academic Libraries. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Company, 1972.
- Palmour, Vernon E., Bellassai, Marcia C., and Gray, Lucy M. Access to Periodical Resources: A National Plan. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, February 1974.
- Shollenberger, Richard C. "Oh, That Library Loan." RQ 11:4:343-5 (Summer 1972).

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF LIBRARY DIRECTORS  
AND INTERLIBRARY LOAN LIBRARIANS

This appendix presents selected results of a mail survey of library directors and interlibrary loan librarians. The questionnaires solicited attitudes, opinions, and data on interlibrary loan activities. A nationally representative sample of 189 academic institutions was drawn for data collection purposes, and responses were received from 157 library directors and from 157 interlibrary loan librarians.

Relevant highlights of the survey results include:

- 67% of responding libraries with collection sizes of 500,000 or more volumes received 3,000 or more lending requests in 1972. Smaller libraries responding all received fewer than 3,000 requests.
- 72% of responding libraries are net lenders; that is, they lend more than they borrow. 11% of the net lending libraries have lending/borrowing ratios greater than 7.0:1.
- 42% of the library directors stated that the volume of ILL lending is a burden; of these, 94% said cost of lending was a reason for burden, and 53% mentioned the photocopy load as a reason. More than two-thirds of the directors of libraries receiving 3,000 or more requests perceived an ILL burden.
- 84% of responding libraries belong to some type of consortium or network for ILL.
- 24% of the library directors felt that under no circumstances should academic libraries be compensated for ILL lending.
- 47% receive compensation for some ILL activities.
- 18% of the library directors are contemplating measures to recover ILL costs.
- 50% charge for all photocopy loans.
- 84% pass charges for photocopies on to patrons.

## A.2 Introduction to the Survey

As one phase of investigating means of improving the present interlibrary loan system, Westat designed and conducted a survey of library directors and interlibrary loan librarians. The survey not only provided more background information on current interlibrary loan practices and policies in academic libraries, but also gathered suggestions and attitudes on both an interlibrary loan fee system and a national periodicals resources center. The survey results served as planning data in developing a possible fee structure for interlibrary loan and in designing a national periodical resources system.

## A.3 Sample Design

It was decided that the appropriate sampling universe for this survey would be the sampling frame developed for A Study of the Characteristics, Costs, and Magnitude of Interlibrary Loans in Academic Libraries (Westat, 1971). The sampling frame therefore consisted of the academic institutions reported in Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Data for Individual Institutions, Fall 1968 (USOE), the 1971 ARL membership list, and the American Library Directory. The 1971 sampling frame was updated for the 1973 study by substituting the 1973 ARL membership list.

As discussed in Appendix D of the 1971 study, four stratification variables were taken into account in selecting the sample:

1. Number of interlibrary loan transactions as indicated by the 1968 statistics for libraries published by the Office of Education,
2. Total volumes in collection,

3. Geographical location,
4. Type of institutional funding, public or private.

The stratification variables of primary interest for the 1973 survey were the total collection size and the public/private classification. The public and private institutions were each stratified as follows:

- Stratum 1 - academic institutions with 20,000-99,999 volumes
- 2 - academic institutions with 100,000-499,999 volumes
- 3 - academic institutions (non-ARL) with 500,000 or more volumes
- 4 - ARL - member libraries

The total numbers of institutions in the sampling frame, taking into account the stratification variables, are presented in the chart below:

| <u>Stratum</u> | <u>Funding Source</u> |                |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
|                | <u>Public</u>         | <u>Private</u> |
| 1              | 247                   | 589            |
| 2              | 161                   | 193            |
| 3              | 24                    | 13             |
| 4              | 47                    | 28             |
| Total          | 479                   | 823            |

Using this frame, a systematic selection of institutions was made within each stratum. The sample size for each stratum was allocated in proportion to the number of volumes owned by the institutions in the stratum. All ARL libraries and those institutions with collection size 500,000 or greater



were selected with certainty. The distribution of sample institutions was as follows:

| <u>Stratum</u> | <u>Funding Source</u> |                |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
|                | <u>Public</u>         | <u>Private</u> |
| 1              | 7                     | 17             |
| 2              | 19                    | 19             |
| 3              | 24                    | 13             |
| 4              | 47                    | 28             |
| Total          | 97                    | 77             |

In addition, 15 other ARL-member libraries (non-U.S. and/or non-academic) were sampled with certainty bringing the total sample size to 189 libraries.

#### A.4 Survey Methodology

The collection instruments, Form I-Director's Form and Form II-ILL Librarian's Form, were developed by Westat and reviewed with the ARL Advisory Committee for the study. The forms were also pretested at the University of Maryland, the University of Colorado, and the University of Washington. The final revision of each questionnaire reflected the suggestions and reactions of the committee and the pretest participants.

Data collection involved a simple mail survey of the library director and ILL librarian at the 189 sample institutions. Survey packages were mailed to the library directors at the end of March, 1973; each package included survey materials for both the director and the ILL librarian. The library directors were asked to forward one copy of the cover letter, the ILL Librarian's Form, and a return envelope to the ILL librarian in his main library. The cover letter encouraged the respondents to return their completed questionnaires to Westat within two weeks and to

contact Westat with any questions or problems. The cover letter and the survey questionnaires are shown in Exhibits 1, 2, and 3.

During the last two weeks of May, 1973, all nonrespondents were contacted by telephone. The nonrespondents were encouraged to complete and return their questionnaires at their earliest convenience. If the survey package had been lost in the mail or misplaced, Westat then provided additional copies to be completed as soon as possible. These followup activities aided in increasing the overall response rate for the survey.

#### A.5      Data Preparation and Tabulation

Completed questionnaires were returned to Westat by mail from the participating libraries. Each form received was logged in and assigned a unique identification number. The response rate was 83 percent both for the Director's Form and for the ILL Librarian's Form. This response rate represents the proportion of sample institutions from which useable returns were received. The few additional responses received were from libraries for which many of the questions were not applicable, and therefore the data was too sketchy for analysis.

Coding manuals were prepared specifically for the data collection forms used in this survey. Most of the questionnaire items were precoded, while coding categories for the open-ended questions were developed after inspection of the actual answers received. Responses were coded directly on each questionnaire.

After completion of the coding activities, the questionnaire responses were keypunched directly from the coded survey forms. The data cards were then edited manually (and corrected where necessary) in preparation for computer processing.

In the machine processing, data cards were read directly by the computer. Marginal tabulations and selected cross-tabulations were produced.

#### A.6 Survey Results

Selected unweighted results of this survey are presented in Tables A-1 - A-15 and in the body of this report. The tables summarize the responses of library directors and ILL librarians to questions concerning the financing of interlibrary loans. The tabulations were based on the numbers of respondents given below by library collection size:

| Type of Respondent | Collection Size, as Sampled (volumes) |                      |                     |                      | Total |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------|
|                    | 20,000 -<br>99,999                    | 100,000 -<br>499,999 | 500,000<br>and Over | Other ARL<br>Members |       |
| Director           | 16                                    | 29                   | 102                 | 10                   | 157   |
| ILL Librarian      | 15                                    | 30                   | 102                 | 10                   | 157   |

Proportions shown in Tables A-1 - A-15 and in Table 11 in the text are based on the total number of respondents in a stratum rather than the number for whom a particular question was applicable. Proportions in Tables 1-6, 9, and 10 in the text are based on the number of respondents, as specified in the tables, for whom the tabulation was applicable.

## ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES



The Association of Research Libraries, under a grant from the National Science Foundation, is currently sponsoring a "Study of an Improved Interlibrary Loan System for Academic Libraries." As part of the overall study, ARL has contracted with Westat, Inc. of Rockville, Maryland, to investigate and make recommendations on two aspects of the interlibrary loan system; the Westat study covers (1) a more equitable method of financing interlibrary loans, and (2) the feasibility of a national periodicals resources center to provide long-range improvements in the system.

In order to obtain information and opinions on these topics from library directors and interlibrary loan librarians, Westat has designed the enclosed questionnaires. These forms have been sent to a nationally representative sample of 174 libraries, including 75 ARL member libraries. Questionnaires have also been sent to four Canadian academic libraries which are also members of ARL. Please complete Form I yourself, and ask the interlibrary loan librarian at your main library to respond to Form II (a copy of this letter is attached to Form II). Your responses will be most useful to Westat in recommending changes and improvements in the financial structure of ILL and in determining the feasibility of a national periodicals resources center.

Your cooperation in this important study will be greatly appreciated. Please complete and return the enclosed forms to Westat by April 15. If you have any questions, contact either Gene Palmour or Lucy Gray at Westat, (301) 881-5310.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. McCarthy  
Executive Director

March, 1973

FORM I

Exhibit 2  
Page 1 of 8

INTERLIBRARY LOAN STUDY  
DIRECTOR'S FORM

Name of Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Address of  
Main Library: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Person Completing  
Questionnaire: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Upon completion of this questionnaire, please return it to

Westat, Inc.  
11600 Nebel Street  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

If you have any questions, please contact V. E. Palmour at  
(301) 881-5310 (call collect).



### INTRODUCTION

Many large libraries are experiencing an increasingly burdensome volume of interlibrary loan requests. While it is certainly not possible for any library to meet all of its own needs and librarians are understandably reluctant to impede the exchange of materials, the drain on library resources of some large libraries is considerable, and it becomes increasingly evident that the interlibrary loan system must both become more efficient and dependable and incorporate some equitable measures for compensating heavy lenders.

The Association of Research Libraries, through Westat, Inc., is attempting to develop a system embodying such measures for recommendation to its members. This questionnaire is designed to elicit the patterns and problems of ILL lending and borrowing at your institution, as well as your preferences for methods of improvement. It is of the utmost importance that any system recommended be relevant to the range of needs of member libraries. Your cooperation in supplying the data requested, as well as your comments and suggestions, will be most helpful.

### INSTRUCTIONS

- In responding to this questionnaire, you will find several types of questions. The format is such that, in most questions, you will circle the number(s) next to the answer(s) you select; the remaining questions call for either "fill-in-the-blank" or discussion-type answers.
- Unless otherwise specified, please base your responses on your own experience and/or your own opinion of the topics under discussion.
- Your responses will be summarized with those of other librarians to provide guidelines for Westat in the design of possible financing methods for ILL and of a feasible national periodicals resources center.

### INTERLIBRARY LENDING

- 1a. Is the volume of ILL lending at your library a burden on your resources and services?

Yes. . . . . 1  
No . . . (Skip to Q. 2a) 2

- 1b. If yes, in what way(s)? (Circle all that apply.)

Cost of lending. . . . . 1  
Deterioration of materials . . . . . 2  
Loss of local use. . . . . 3  
Photocopying load. . . . . 4  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 5

- 2a. Do you belong to any consortium or network cooperative arrangement with other libraries for interlibrary loans?

Yes. . . . . 1  
No . . . . (Skip to Q. 3) 2

2b. If yes, please identify by name under the appropriate category below:

Local \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
State \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Regional \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
National \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. What is your attitude toward ILL lending of materials to the following categories of borrowers? (Please circle those answers that best express your views.)

| Category of borrowing library                                  | Attitude toward ILL service    |                                        |                                           |                           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                                                                | We have an obligation to serve | No obligation but are willing to serve | Would prefer to serve only those in-state | Think we should not serve |
| Members of network or consortium to which we belong. . . . .   | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |
| ARL libraries. . . . .                                         | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |
| Academic libraries (with undergraduate programs only). . . . . | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |
| Academic libraries (with graduate programs). . . . .           | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |
| Public libraries . . . . .                                     | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |
| Government research libraries. . . . .                         | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |
| Special libraries. . . . .                                     | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |
| Any library requesting loan. . . . .                           | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |
| Other (Specify) _____                                          | 1                              | 2                                      | 3                                         | 4                         |

4a. Are there circumstances in which academic libraries should be compensated for interlibrary lending activities?

- No . . . . . (Skip to Q. 5a) 1  
Only privately funded libraries should  
be compensated. . . . . (Skip to Q. 5a) 2  
Yes, if requests for loans exceed the borrowing  
requests sent to the same library (Skip to Q. 5a) 3  
Yes, in all cases. . . . . (Skip to Q. 5a) 4  
Yes, in some cases . . . . . 5

4b. If you circled (5) above, please indicate below those borrowing libraries from which compensation should be received.

| <u>Category of borrowing library</u>                               | <u>In-state</u> | <u>Out-of-state</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Members of network or consortium<br>to which we belong . . . . .   | 1               | 2                   |
| ARL libraries . . . . .                                            | 1               | 2                   |
| Academic libraries<br>(with undergraduate programs only) . . . . . | 1               | 2                   |
| Academic libraries<br>(with graduate programs) . . . . .           | 1               | 2                   |
| Public libraries . . . . .                                         | 1               | 2                   |
| Government research libraries . . . . .                            | 1               | 2                   |
| Special libraries . . . . .                                        | 1               | 2                   |
| Any library requesting loan . . . . .                              | 1               | 2                   |
| Other (Specify) _____                                              | 1               | 2                   |

5a. Do you receive any compensation for interlibrary lending activities?

- Yes. . . . . 1  
No . . . (Skip to Q. 6a) 2

5b. If yes, list sources (e.g., borrowing library, state network, industries, etc.) and indicate method of payment received (e.g., grant, per transaction fees paid on some cumulative basis, etc.).

| <u>Source</u> | <u>Method of payment</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| _____         | _____                    |
| _____         | _____                    |
| _____         | _____                    |
| _____         | _____                    |

6a. Are you contemplating any measures to recover costs of interlibrary lending?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No . . . . . (Skip to Q. 7) 2

6b. If yes, please describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. If you were to institute such charges, would you ask payment for (circle all that apply):

Filled requests. . . . . 1  
Searching of unfilled requests . . . . . 2  
Photocopies. . . . . 3  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

8. Would charges for interlibrary lending services be (circle all that apply):

A flat fee for each request. . . . . 1  
Different for filled and unfilled requests . 2  
Higher if verification were required . . . . 3  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

# INTERLIBRARY BORROWING

9. Do you feel that needs of your users for items not available in your collection are adequately met through current ILL operations?

|                                        | Yes | No |
|----------------------------------------|-----|----|
| For monographs . . . . .               | 1   | 2  |
| For periodicals. . . . .               | 1   | 2  |
| For other materials (Specify). . . . . | 1   | 2  |

10a. If your library had to pay a fee for all materials borrowed through ILL, what effect would this have on your ILL borrowing policies?

No change in borrowing policies  
or volume . . . . . (Skip to Q. 11) 1  
Seek other sources for materials  
needed. . . . . (Skip to Q. 11) 2  
Change policies on user eligibility  
for ILL → . . . . . (Skip to Q. 11) 3  
How? \_\_\_\_\_  
Pass charge on to our own patron making  
ILL request . . . . . 4  
Other (Specify). . . . . (Skip to Q. 11) 5

10b. If you circled (4) in Q. 10a, please indicate in the chart below which of your patrons would be charged for interlibrary borrowing services.

| Type of patron               | Currently eligible to use ILL | Would pass on partial cost of fee | Would pass on total cost of fee | Would charge flat fee | Pass on fee for photocopies only | Would not charge fee |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Faculty . . . . .            | 1                             | 2                                 | 3                               | 4                     | 5                                | 6                    |
| Staff . . . . .              | 1                             | 2                                 | 3                               | 4                     | 5                                | 6                    |
| Master's candidates. . . . . | 1                             | 2                                 | 3                               | 4                     | 5                                | 6                    |
| Doctoral candidates. . . . . | 1                             | 2                                 | 3                               | 4                     | 5                                | 6                    |
| Undergraduates. . . . .      | 1                             | 2                                 | 3                               | 4                     | 5                                | 6                    |
| Other (Specify) _____        | 1                             | 2                                 | 3                               | 4                     | 5                                | 6                    |

11. If a fee system for interlibrary borrowing and lending were instituted, what would you prefer as the method for paying and collecting fees?  
(Please circle only one answer.)

Billing by lending library and payment by borrowing library against:

|                                  |    |
|----------------------------------|----|
| Individual transaction . . . . . | 01 |
| Monthly statement. . . . .       | 02 |
| Quarterly statement. . . . .     | 03 |
| Semi-annual statement. . . . .   | 04 |
| Annual statement . . . . .       | 05 |

A clearinghouse operation which would provide for net billing or payment (determined by status as net lender or borrower) for individual libraries against:

|                                |    |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Monthly statement. . . . .     | 06 |
| Quarterly statement. . . . .   | 07 |
| Semi-annual statement. . . . . | 08 |
| Annual statement . . . . .     | 09 |
| Deposit account. . . . .       | 10 |

Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 11

12. If you have any other comments or suggestions on compensation for interlibrary lending and borrowing, please give them in the following space.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



About half of all ILL requests in 1970/71 involved periodical materials. Of this number, it is estimated that approximately half the requests went unfilled because the material was in use, non-circulating, in bindery, missing, or was not owned by the library to which the request was sent. Among large libraries, almost three-quarters of the periodicals requested were in the English language.

It has been suggested that a national periodicals resources center be established which would provide fast, dependable service for needed periodical materials.

13. Assuming that a reasonable charge for services was made to support the operation of the center, what should such a center provide?

Photocopies only (requests for original issues  
to be directed to normal ILL channels). . . . . 1  
Photocopies or original, as requested. . . . . 2  
Photocopies of articles and microfilms of issues,  
as requested. . . . . 3  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

14. Should the titles held by the center be:

Most commonly used . . . . . 1  
Little used. . . . . 2  
Both commonly and little used. . . . . 3

15. Should the center hold:

Only English-language materials. . . . . 1  
Only non-English-language materials. . . . . 2  
Both English and non-English . . . . . 3  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

- 16a. If a periodicals resources center could improve both the current speed of delivery and dependability in meeting ILL needs, would you support its establishment?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No . . . (Skip to Q. 17) 2

- 16b. If yes, in what ways (circle as many as apply)?

By membership fee (if required). . . . . 1  
By payment for individual requests  
(transaction basis) . . . . . 2  
By contributing back runs of little used  
materials . . . . . 3  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

17. If a transaction fee were used, either alone or in combination with a membership fee, would you prefer:

Flat fee (coupon book) . . . . . 1  
Invoice for each transaction . . . . . 2  
Deposit account. . . . . 3  
Monthly statement . . . . . 4  
Quarterly statement. . . . . 5  
Annual statement . . . . . 6  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 7

18a. If periodical materials were available through a national resources center, would you continue to fill ILL requests for these materials?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No . . (Skip to Q. 19a) 2

18b. If yes, to what extent?

Only for materials not available at center . . . . . 1  
For any materials requested. . . . . 2  
Only for libraries in network(s) to which  
we have commitments . . . . . 3  
Only requests from local libraries . . . . . 4  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 5

19a. Would availability of materials from a dependable resources center have any effect upon your periodicals acquisition policies?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No . . (Skip to Q. 20) 2

19b. If yes, how? (Circle as many as apply.)

Eliminate little used journals . . . . . 1  
Reduce number of copies of some journals . . . . . 2  
Encourage review of policies and holdings in  
terms of use, alternate sources, retention  
of back issues, etc. . . . . 3  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

20. Please give any other comments on your idea of a national periodicals resources center, especially on possible funding for both establishment and continuing support of such a center.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

INTERLIBRARY LOAN STUDY  
ILL LIBRARIAN'S FORM

Name of Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Address of  
Main Library: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Person Completing  
Questionnaire: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Upon completion of this questionnaire, please return it to

Westat, Inc.  
11600 Nebel Street  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

If you have any questions, please contact V. E. Palmour at  
(301) 881-5310 (call collect).

# INTRODUCTION

Many large libraries are experiencing an increasingly burdensome volume of interlibrary loan requests. While it is certainly not possible for any library to meet all of its own needs and librarians are understandably reluctant to impede the exchange of materials, the drain on library resources of some large libraries is considerable, and it becomes increasingly evident that the inter-library loan system must both become more efficient and dependable and incorporate some equitable measures for compensating heavy lenders.

The Association of Research Libraries, through Westat, Inc., is attempting to develop a system embodying such measures for recommendation to its members. This questionnaire is designed to elicit the patterns and problems of ILL lending and borrowing at your institution, as well as your preferences for methods of improvement. It is of the utmost importance that any system recommended be relevant to the range of needs of member libraries. Your cooperation in supplying the data requested, as well as your comments and suggestions, will be most helpful.

## INSTRUCTIONS

- In responding to this questionnaire, you will find several types of questions. The format is such that, in most questions, you will circle the number(s) next to the answer(s) you select; the remaining questions call for either "fill-in-the-blank" or discussion-type answers.
- Unless otherwise specified, please base your responses on your own experience and/or your own opinion of the topics under discussion.
- Your responses will be summarized with those of other librarians to provide guidelines for Westat in the design of possible financing methods for ILL and of a feasible national periodicals resources center.

## ILL ACTIVITIES

- 1a. Please summarize your interlibrary lending and borrowing activities for the year 1972 in the chart below.

| <u>Activity</u>       | <u>Total number<br/>of requests</u> | <u>Number<br/>filled</u> | <u>Number<br/>not filled</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>LENDING</b>        |                                     |                          |                              |
| Total (all materials) | _____                               | _____                    | _____                        |
| Periodicals           | _____                               | _____                    | _____                        |
| Photocopies           | _____                               | _____                    | _____                        |
| <b>BORROWING</b>      |                                     |                          |                              |
| Total (all materials) | _____                               | _____                    | _____                        |
| Periodicals           | _____                               | _____                    | _____                        |
| Photocopies           | _____                               | _____                    | _____                        |

- 1b. Do the figures reported above represent:

Volumes . . . . . 1  
Titles . . . . . 2

- 1c. What is the total number of volumes held by your library?

\_\_\_\_\_ (volumes)

2. Does your library use a teletype facility for interlibrary borrowing and lending?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No. . . . . 2

3. Please complete the following chart by estimating the percent of borrowing and lending requests which you transmit or receive by:

|                       | <u>Borrowing</u> | <u>Lending</u> |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Mail                  | _____ %          | _____ %        |
| TWX                   | _____ %          | _____ %        |
| Other (Specify) _____ | _____ %          | _____ %        |

INTERLIBRARY LENDING

4. Are interlibrary loan requests for photocopies referred to a separate reproduction department?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No. . . . . 2

5. Under which of the following conditions do you provide photocopies of periodical material requested of you through interlibrary loan? Do you charge the borrowing library for the photocopies?

| <u>Conditions</u>                                     | <u>Provide photocopies</u> |           | <u>Charge for photocopies</u> |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|
|                                                       | <u>yes</u>                 | <u>no</u> | <u>yes</u>                    | <u>no</u> |
| For all periodical requests. . . . .                  | 1                          | 2         | 3                             | 4         |
| For non-circulating materials. . . . .                | 1                          | 2         | 3                             | 4         |
| Only when photocopy is requested . . . . .            | 1                          | 2         | 3                             | 4         |
| <u>Routinely</u> to network or consortium members . . | 1                          | 2         | 3                             | 4         |
| <u>On request</u> to network or consortium members. . | 1                          | 2         | 3                             | 4         |
| Other (Specify) _____                                 | 1                          | 2         | 3                             | 4         |



INTERLIBRARY BORROWING

In the following questions we would like to obtain an idea of the process you generally use in selecting a library to which an ILL borrowing request is sent.

6. What is the most important factor in selecting a library to which an ILL request is sent?

---



---



---



---

7. What are your most important bibliographic tools for determining the library from which you will request a desired item? (Circle all that apply.)

Network or cooperative tool (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 1

Catalog(s) (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 2

In-house tools (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 3

Other (Specify those most commonly used) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

- 8a. Do you utilize any bibliographic centers (e.g., Denver, Philadelphia, CRL) to verify and locate materials needed?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No . . . . . (Skip to Q. 9) 2

- 8b. If yes, please identify the centers below and note degree of success in verification and location at each.

| <u>Center</u> | <u>Degree of success</u> |                 |
|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
|               | <u>Verification</u>      | <u>Location</u> |
| _____         | _____ %                  | _____ %         |
| _____         | _____ %                  | _____ %         |
| _____         | _____ %                  | _____ %         |
| _____         | _____ %                  | _____ %         |

9. Why do you select a specific library when no source is known? (Circle all that apply.)

Because we both belong to the same network or cooperative arrangement. . . . . 1  
Because of location of library in relation to mine. . . . . 2  
Because of past success in subject area at that library . . . . . 3  
Because of library subject collection . . . . . 4  
Because of size of library. . . . . 5  
Because of general cooperativeness of library to which request is dispatched . . . . . 6  
Because of general likelihood of success. . . . . 7  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 8

- 10a. Are unfilled requests forwarded to several libraries before the request is permanently considered unfilled?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No. . . . . (Skip to Q. 11) 2

- 10b. If yes, what is the average number of additional attempts?

\_\_\_\_\_

11. Do you use the three national libraries as ILL resources?

|                                                                     | <u>Routinely</u> | <u>Seldom</u> | <u>As last Resort</u> | <u>Never</u> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| NAL for all agricultural materials. . . . . 1                       | 2                | 3             | 4                     |              |
| NAL for agricultural materials not available elsewhere. . . . . 1   | 2                | 3             | 4                     |              |
| NLM system for all medical materials . . . . . 1                    | 2                | 3             | 4                     |              |
| NLM system for medical materials not available elsewhere. . . . . 1 | 2                | 3             | 4                     |              |
| LC for materials in any field . . . . . 1                           | 2                | 3             | 4                     |              |
| LC for materials in any field not located elsewhere. . . . . 1      | 2                | 3             | 4                     |              |

- 12a. Do you order photocopies of periodical articles?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No. . . . . (Skip to Q. 13) 2

- 12b. If yes, under what circumstances?

Routinely . . . . . 1  
When patron requests it and is willing to pay for it . . . . . 2  
Only when original cannot be supplied . . . . . 3  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 4

13. If available, in what form do you prefer borrowing periodical materials?

Original. . . . . 1  
Photocopy . . . . . 2  
Microform . . . . . 3  
Tearsheets. . . . . 4  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 5

14a. Do you charge your patrons (or their departments, research project funds, etc.) for photocopies obtained through ILL whenever the lending library charges your library?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No. . . . . (Skip to Q. 15) 2

14b. If yes, under what circumstances?

Always. . . . . 1  
Some categories of users only . . . . . 2  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 3

#### NATIONAL PERIODICALS RESOURCES CENTER

About half of all ILL transactions in 1970/71 involved periodical materials. Of this number it is estimated that approximately half of the requests went unfilled because the material was in use, non-circulating, in bindery, missing, or was not owned by the library to which the request was sent. Among large libraries, almost three-quarters of the periodicals requested were in the English language.

It has been suggested that a national periodicals resources center be established which would provide fast, dependable service for needed periodical materials.

15a. From the viewpoint of your patrons, what would be the maximum acceptable time delay in requesting materials from the center (from time user makes request to time materials received in your office).

5 days. . . . . 1  
7 days. . . . . 2  
10 days . . . . . 3  
14 days . . . . . 4  
21 days . . . . . 5  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 6

15b. From the viewpoint of your patrons, what would be the minimum acceptable fill rate from the center?

90 percent. . . . . 1  
80 percent. . . . . 2  
70 percent. . . . . 3  
60 percent. . . . . 4  
50 percent. . . . . 5  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 6

15c. Please describe below any other characteristics that would be desirable in a national periodicals resources center.

---



---



---



---

16. Please indicate, for periodicals in each subject field below, the frequency of use, language, and currency that would satisfy most of your borrowing requirements for periodical materials.

| Periodicals by subject,<br>frequency of use,<br>and language | Current titles    |                  |                          | Deceased titles   |                  |             |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|
|                                                              | Last 12<br>months | Last 10<br>years | Vol. 1, No. 1<br>to date | Last 12<br>months | Last 10<br>years | Full<br>set |
| <u>Humanities</u>                                            |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| • Commonly used titles                                       |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| English . . . . .                                            | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Western European<br>language. . . . .                        | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Other foreign<br>language. . . . .                           | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| • Little used titles                                         |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| English . . . . .                                            | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Western European<br>language. . . . .                        | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Other foreign<br>language. . . . .                           | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| <u>Social Sciences</u>                                       |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| • Commonly used titles                                       |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| English . . . . .                                            | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Western European<br>language. . . . .                        | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Other foreign<br>language. . . . .                           | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| • Little used titles                                         |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| English . . . . .                                            | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Western European<br>language. . . . .                        | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Other foreign<br>language. . . . .                           | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| <u>Science and Technology</u>                                |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| • Commonly used titles                                       |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| English . . . . .                                            | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Western European<br>language. . . . .                        | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Other foreign<br>language. . . . .                           | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| • Little used titles                                         |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| English . . . . .                                            | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Western European<br>language. . . . .                        | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Other foreign<br>language. . . . .                           | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |
| Other (Specify) _____                                        |                   |                  |                          |                   |                  |             |
| _____                                                        | 1                 | 2                | 3                        | 4                 | 5                | 6           |

- 17a. If periodical materials were available to all libraries through a periodicals resources center, would you continue to fill requests from other libraries for periodical materials?

Yes . . . . . 1  
No. . . . . (Skip to Q. 18) 2

- 17b. If yes, to what extent? (Circle all that apply.)

Only for libraries to which we have  
existing commitments . . . . . 1  
for all libraries which we presently  
serve. . . . . 2  
Only for local libraries. . . . . 3  
Only for materials not available at  
the center . . . . . 4  
For any materials requested . . . . . 5  
Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_ 6

18. Please use the space below to make comments and suggestions that you feel would be helpful in our feasibility study of a national periodicals resources center.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.



Table A-1 Directors: Type of ILL lending burden experienced by collection size of responding library

| ILL Lending Burden         | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                            | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| None                       | 100%                                  | 93%             | 41%              | 50%               | 57%           | 99                |
| Yes                        | -                                     | 7%              | 53%              | 50%               | 42%           | 66                |
| Cost of lending            | -                                     | 7%              | 55%              | 40%               | 39%           | 62                |
| Deterioration of materials | -                                     | 3%              | 23%              | 20%               | 17%           | 20                |
| Loss of local use          | -                                     | 3%              | 23%              | -                 | 15%           | 24                |
| Photocopying load          | -                                     | 3%              | 28%              | 50%               | 22%           | 35                |
| Other                      | -                                     | 3%              | 7%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| Don't Know                 | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| No Answer                  | -                                     | -               | 1%               | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| TOTAL                      | 100%                                  | 100%            | 100%             | 100%              | 100%          | 157               |

Table A-2 Directors: Type of ILL lending burden experienced by collection size of responding library and by public/private status of library

| ILL Lending Burden         | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |         |                   |         |                  |         |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
|                            | 20,000 - 99,999                       |         | 100,000 - 499,999 |         | 500,000 and over |         |
|                            | Public                                | Private | Public            | Private | Public           | Private |
| None                       | 100%                                  | 100%    | 87%               | 100%    | 44%              | 37%     |
| Yes                        | -                                     | -       | 13%               | -       | 54%              | 63%     |
| Cost of lending            | -                                     | -       | 13%               | -       | 49%              | 63%     |
| Deterioration of materials | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | 21%              | 24%     |
| Loss of local use          | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | 23%              | 21%     |
| Photocopying load          | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | 33%              | 22%     |
| Other                      | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | 7%               | 7%      |
| Don't Know                 | -                                     | -       | -                 | -       | -                | -       |
| No Answer                  | -                                     | -       | -                 | -       | 2%               | -       |
| TOTAL                      | 100%                                  | 100%    | 100%              | 100%    | 100%             | 100%    |

Table A-3 Directors: Membership in consortia or networks by collection size of responding library

| Membership in Consortia or Networks  | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |  | Other ARL Members | All Libraries | Total Respondents |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                      | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over |  |                   |               |                   |
| None                                 | 38%                                   | 31%             | 7%               |  | 30%               | 16%           | 25                |
| Yes                                  | 62%                                   | 69%             | 93%              |  | 70%               | 84%           | 132               |
| local only                           | 13%                                   | 10%             | 8%               |  | -                 | 10%           | 13                |
| state only                           | 25%                                   | 14%             | 15%              |  | 20%               | 19%           | 25                |
| regional only                        | 13%                                   | 7%              | 7%               |  | 10%               | 9%            | 12                |
| national only                        | -                                     | -               | 2%               |  | 10%               | 2%            | 3                 |
| local and state                      | 6%                                    | 21%             | 13%              |  | -                 | 16%           | 20                |
| local and regional                   | -                                     | 7%              | 3%               |  | -                 | 4%            | 5                 |
| local and national                   | -                                     | -               | 1%               |  | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| state and regional                   | -                                     | -               | 14%              |  | 10%               | 12%           | 15                |
| state and national                   | -                                     | -               | 9%               |  | 10%               | 8%            | 10                |
| regional and national                | -                                     | 3%              | -                |  | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| local, state, and regional           | -                                     | 3%              | 8%               |  | -                 | 7%            | 9                 |
| local, state, and national           | -                                     | -               | 3%               |  | -                 | 2%            | 3                 |
| local, regional, and national        | 6%                                    | -               | -                |  | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| state, regional, and national        | -                                     | -               | 8%               |  | 10%               | 6%            | 8                 |
| local, state, regional, and national | -                                     | -               | 5%               |  | -                 | 4%            | 5                 |
| Don't Know                           | -                                     | -               | -                |  | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| No Answer                            | -                                     | -               | -                |  | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| TOTAL                                | 100%                                  | 100%            | 100%             |  | 100%              | 100%          | 157               |

Table A-4 Directors: Attitude toward lending to types of borrowing libraries by collection size of responding library

| Attitude Toward Lending To:                      | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                                  | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Members of network or consortium                 |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve                              | 50%                                   | 62%             | 85%              | 80%               | 76%           | 120               |
| no obligation, willing to serve                  | 19%                                   | 17%             | 7%               | -                 | 10%           | 15                |
| prefer to serve in-state only                    | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| think we should not serve                        | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| ARL libraries                                    |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve                              | 19%                                   | 41%             | 49%              | 70%               | 46%           | 7                 |
| no obligation, willing to serve                  | 50%                                   | 48%             | 45%              | 10%               | 44%           | 69                |
| prefer to serve in-state only                    | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| think we should not serve                        | -                                     | 4%              | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| Academic libraries (undergraduate programs only) |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve                              | 19%                                   | 21%             | 12%              | 40%               | 16%           | 25                |
| no obligation, willing to serve                  | 56%                                   | 48%             | 35%              | 10%               | 38%           | 60                |
| prefer to serve in-state only                    | -                                     | 10%             | 28%              | 10%               | 21%           | 33                |
| think we should not serve                        | 6%                                    | 7%              | 16%              | -                 | 12%           | 19                |
| Academic libraries (with graduate programs)      |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve                              | 25%                                   | 45%             | 43%              | 70%               | 43%           | 68                |
| no obligation, willing to serve                  | 63%                                   | 45%             | 49%              | 20%               | 48%           | 75                |
| prefer to serve in-state only                    | -                                     | 3%              | 2%               | -                 | 2%            | 3                 |
| think we should not serve                        | -                                     | 3%              | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| Public libraries                                 |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve                              | 13%                                   | 14%             | 12%              | 50%               | 15%           | 23                |
| no obligation, willing to serve                  | 50%                                   | 34%             | 37%              | 20%               | 37%           | 58                |
| prefer to serve in-state only                    | 19%                                   | 24%             | 39%              | -                 | 32%           | 50                |
| think we should not serve                        | 6%                                    | 14%             | 5%               | -                 | 6%            | 10                |

Table A-4 (continued)

| Attitude Toward Lending To:     | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |  | Other ARL Members | All Libraries | Total Respondents |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                 | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over |  |                   |               |                   |
| Government Research libraries   |                                       |                 |                  |  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve             | 13%                                   | 28%             | 25%              |  | 70%               | 28%           | 43                |
| no obligation, willing to serve | 63%                                   | 55%             | 64%              |  | 10%               | 59%           | 92                |
| prefer to serve in-state only   | -                                     | 3%              | 5%               |  | -                 | 4%            | 6                 |
| think we should not serve       | -                                     | 3%              | -                |  | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| Special Libraries               |                                       |                 |                  |  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve             | 13%                                   | 21%             | 14%              |  | 60%               | 18%           | 28                |
| no obligation, willing to serve | 63%                                   | 59%             | 59%              |  | 20%               | 57%           | 89                |
| prefer to serve in-state only   | 6%                                    | 7%              | 20%              |  | -                 | 15%           | 23                |
| think we should not serve       | 6%                                    | 3%              | 1%               |  | -                 | 2%            | 3                 |
| Any library requesting a loan   |                                       |                 |                  |  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve             | 13%                                   | 14%             | 9%               |  | 50%               | 13%           | 20                |
| no obligation, willing to serve | 63%                                   | 48%             | 46%              |  | 30%               | 47%           | 74                |
| prefer to serve in-state only   | 13%                                   | 17%             | 24%              |  | -                 | 20%           | 31                |
| think we should not serve       | 6%                                    | 7%              | 17%              |  | 10%               | 14%           | 21                |
| Other Libraries                 |                                       |                 |                  |  |                   |               |                   |
| obligation to serve             | -                                     | 3%              | 3%               |  | 10%               | 3%            | 5                 |
| no obligation, willing to serve | -                                     | 7%              | 1%               |  | 10%               | 3%            | 4                 |
| prefer to serve in-state only   | -                                     | -               | 1%               |  | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| think we should not serve       | -                                     | 7%              | 4%               |  | -                 | 4%            | 6                 |



Table A-5 Directors: Attitude toward lending to types of borrowing libraries by collection size of responding library and by public/private status of library

| Attitude Toward Lending to:                      | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |         |                   |         |                  |         |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
|                                                  | 20,000 - 99,999                       |         | 100,000 - 499,999 |         | 500,000 and over |         |
|                                                  | Public                                | Private | Public            | Private | Public           | Private |
| Members of Network or Consortium                 |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                              | 50%                                   | 50%     |                   |         |                  |         |
| No obligation, willing to serve                  | 25%                                   | 17%     | 60%               | 64%     | 87%              | 81%     |
| Prefer to serve in-state only                    | -                                     | -       | 13%               | 22%     | 6%               | 7%      |
| Think we should not serve                        | -                                     | -       | -                 | -       | -                | -       |
| ARL Libraries                                    |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                              | 50%                                   | 8%      | 47%               | 36%     | 53%              | 40%     |
| No obligation, willing to serve                  | 50%                                   | 50%     | 40%               | 57%     | 44%              | 46%     |
| Prefer to serve in-state only                    | -                                     | -       | -                 | -       | -                | -       |
| Think we should not serve                        | -                                     | -       | 6%                | -       | -                | -       |
| Academic Libraries (undergraduate programs only) |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                              | 50%                                   | 8%      | 13%               | 29%     | 13%              | 10%     |
| No obligation, willing to serve                  | 50%                                   | 59%     | 40%               | 57%     | 34%              | 39%     |
| Prefer to serve in-state only                    | -                                     | -       | 20%               | -       | 30%              | 19%     |
| Think we should not serve                        | -                                     | 8%      | 7%                | 7%      | 11%              | 22%     |
| Academic Libraries (with graduate programs)      |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                              | 50%                                   | 16%     | 53%               | 36%     | 43%              | 44%     |
| No obligation, willing to serve                  | 50%                                   | 67%     | 26%               | 64%     | 52%              | 44%     |
| Prefer to serve in-state only                    | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | -                | 5%      |
| Think we should not serve                        | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | -                | -       |

Table A-5 (Continued)

| Attitude Toward Lending to:          | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |         |                   |         |                  |         |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
|                                      | 20,000 - 99,999                       |         | 100,000 - 499,999 |         | 500,000 and over |         |
|                                      | Public                                | Private | Public            | Private | Public           | Private |
| <b>Public Libraries</b>              |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                  | 50%                                   | -       | 7%                | 21%     | 15%              | 7%      |
| No obligation, willing to serve      | 50%                                   | 50%     | 33%               | 36%     | 33%              | 44%     |
| Prefer to serve in-state only        | -                                     | 25%     | 20%               | 29%     | 43%              | 34%     |
| Think we should not serve            | -                                     | 8%      | 20%               | 7%      | 5%               | 5%      |
| <b>Government Research Libraries</b> |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                  | 50%                                   | -       | 33%               | 22%     | 26%              | 24%     |
| No obligation, willing to serve      | 50%                                   | 67%     | 47%               | 64%     | 64%              | 64%     |
| Prefer to serve in-state only        | -                                     | -       | -                 | 7%      | 5%               | 5%      |
| Think we should not serve            | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | -                | -       |
| <b>Special Libraries</b>             |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                  | 50%                                   | -       | 20%               | 22%     | 20%              | 5%      |
| No obligation, willing to serve      | 50%                                   | 67%     | 53%               | 64%     | 49%              | 73%     |
| Prefer to serve in-state only        | -                                     | 8%      | 7%                | 7%      | 23%              | 15%     |
| Think we should not serve            | -                                     | 8%      | 7%                | -       | 2%               | -       |
| <b>Any Library Requesting a Loan</b> |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                  | 50%                                   | -       | 6%                | 21%     | 12%              | 5%      |
| No obligation, willing to serve      | 50%                                   | 67%     | 53%               | 43%     | 48%              | 44%     |
| Prefer to serve in-state only        | -                                     | 17%     | 27%               | 7%      | 26%              | 20%     |
| Think we should not serve            | -                                     | 8%      | 7%                | 7%      | 11%              | 24%     |
| <b>Other Libraries</b>               |                                       |         |                   |         |                  |         |
| Obligation to serve                  | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | 5%               | -       |
| No obligation, willing to serve      | -                                     | -       | 13%               | -       | -                | 3%      |
| Prefer to serve in-state only        | -                                     | -       | -                 | -       | 1%               | -       |
| Think we should not serve            | -                                     | -       | 7%                | 7%      | 5%               | 5%      |

Table A-6 Directors: Borrowing libraries from which compensation should be received by collection size of responding library

| Borrowing Libraries from Which Compensation Should Be Received | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                                                | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Members of network or consortium                               |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| in-state                                                       | -                                     | -               | 3%               | -                 | 2%            | 3                 |
| out-of-state                                                   | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| in/out-of-state                                                | -                                     | -               | 2%               | 10%               | 2%            | 3                 |
| ARL libraries                                                  |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| in-state                                                       | 6%                                    | -               | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| out-of-state                                                   | -                                     | -               | 5%               | -                 | 3%            | 5                 |
| in/out-of-state                                                | -                                     | -               | 3%               | -                 | 2%            | 3                 |
| Academic libraries (undergraduate programs only)               |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| in-state                                                       | 6%                                    | -               | 1%               | -                 | 1%            | 2                 |
| out-of-state                                                   | -                                     | 4%              | 9%               | -                 | 6%            | 10                |
| in/out-of-state                                                | -                                     | -               | 8%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| Academic libraries (with graduate programs)                    |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| in-state                                                       | 6%                                    | -               | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| out-of-state                                                   | -                                     | -               | 8%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| in/out-of-state                                                | -                                     | -               | 5%               | -                 | 3%            | 5                 |
| Public libraries                                               |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| in-state                                                       | 13%                                   | 3%              | 1%               | -                 | 3%            | 4                 |
| out-of-state                                                   | -                                     | 3%              | 14%              | -                 | 10%           | 15                |
| in/out-of-state                                                | -                                     | -               | 9%               | -                 | 6%            | 9                 |
| Government research libraries                                  |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| in-state                                                       | 6%                                    | 3%              | -                | -                 | 1%            | 2                 |
| out-of-state                                                   | 6%                                    | 3%              | 6%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| in/out-of-state                                                | -                                     | -               | 7%               | -                 | 4%            | 7                 |

Table A-6 (continued)

| Borrowing Libraries from Which Compensation Should Be Received | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   | Total Respondents |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                                                                | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries     |
| Special libraries                                              |                                       |                 |                  |                   |                   |
| in-state                                                       | 6%                                    | 3%              | 2%               | -                 | 3%                |
| out-of-state                                                   | 6%                                    | 3%              | 12%              | -                 | 9%                |
| in/out-of-state                                                | -                                     | -               | 19%              | 10%               | 13%               |
| Any library requesting a loan                                  |                                       |                 |                  |                   |                   |
| in-state                                                       | 6%                                    | -               | -                | -                 | 1%                |
| out-of-state                                                   | -                                     | 3%              | 5%               | -                 | 4%                |
| in/out-of-state                                                | 13%                                   | 13%             | 4%               | 10%               | 6%                |
| Other libraries                                                |                                       |                 |                  |                   |                   |
| in-state                                                       | -                                     | -               | 2%               | -                 | 1%                |
| out-of-state                                                   | -                                     | -               | 2%               | -                 | 1%                |
| in/out-of-state                                                | 6%                                    | 3%              | 8%               | -                 | 6%                |

NOTE: This tabulation was not applicable for 42% of the 141 responding libraries.

76

Table A-7 Directors: Current compensation received for lending by collection size of responding library

| Response                   | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                            | 20,000-99,999                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Some compensation received | 25%                                   | 38%             | 54%              | 40%               | 47%           | 74                |
| No compensation received   | 75%                                   | 62%             | 46%              | 60%               | 53%           | 83                |
| Don't know                 | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| No answer                  | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| TOTAL                      | 100%                                  | 100%            | 100%             | 100%              | 100%          | 157               |



Table A-8 Directors: Method of payment received to compensate ILL activities

| Method of Payment             | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |         |                   |         |                 |         |               |         | Total Respondents |         |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|-----------------|---------|---------------|---------|-------------------|---------|
|                               | 20,000 - 99,999                       |         | 100,000 - 499,999 |         | 500,000 or more |         | All Libraries |         |                   |         |
|                               | Public                                | Private | Public            | Private | Public          | Private | Public        | Private | Public            | Private |
|                               |                                       |         |                   |         |                 |         |               |         |                   |         |
| Reimbursement for photocopies | 25%                                   | 8%      | -                 | 22%     | 8%              | 15%     | 8%            | 15%     | 6                 | 10      |
| Reimbursement for postage     | -                                     | 17%     | 7%                | -       | -               | -       | 1%            | 3%      | 1                 | 2       |
| Fees                          | -                                     | -       | 7%                | -       | 11%             | 15%     | 10%           | 9%      | 8                 | 6       |
| Grants/subsidies              | -                                     | -       | 13%               | -       | 25%             | 19%     | 21%           | 12%     | 17                | 8       |
| Combination of above methods  | -                                     | -       | -                 | 21%     | 13%             | 10%     | 10%           | 10%     | 8                 | 7       |
| Don't know/No answer          | -                                     | -       | 6%                | -       | 2%              | -       | 2%            | -       | 2                 | 0       |
| Not Applicable                | 75%                                   | 75%     | 67%               | 57%     | 41%             | 41%     | 48%           | 51%     | 38                | 34      |
| TOTAL                         | 100%                                  | 100%    | 100%              | 100%    | 100%            | 100%    | 100%          | 100%    | 80                | 67      |
| TOTAL RESPONDENTS             | 4                                     | 12      | 15                | 14      | 61              | 41      | 80            | 67      |                   |         |

NOTE: Libraries classified as "Other ARL Members" were excluded from this tabulation.

Table A-9 Directors: Contemplation of measures to recover costs of lending by collection size of responding library

| Response                   | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                            | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Some measures contemplated | -                                     | 7%              | 22%              | 30%               | 18%           | 28                |
| No measures contemplated   | 88%                                   | 90%             | 75%              | 70%               | 78%           | 123               |
| Don't know                 | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| No answer                  | 12%                                   | 3%              | 3%               | -                 | 4%            | 6                 |
| TOTAL                      | 100%                                  | 100%            | 100%             | 100%              | 100%          | 157               |

Table A-10 Directors: Lending services for which payment would be asked  
(if library were to institute charges) by collection size of  
responding library

| Lending services for which<br>payment would be asked | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                     |                     |                              |                       | Total<br>Res-<br>pond-<br>ents |
|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
|                                                      | 20,000<br>-99,000                     | 100,000-<br>499,999 | 500,000<br>and over | Other<br>ARL<br>Mem-<br>bers | All<br>Lib-<br>raries |                                |
| Filled requests                                      | 12%                                   | 38%                 | 76%                 | 60%                          | 62%                   | 97                             |
| Searching of unfilled requests                       | -                                     | 24%                 | 55%                 | 40%                          | 43%                   | 67                             |
| Photocopies                                          | 75%                                   | 97%                 | 91%                 | 50%                          | 88%                   | 138                            |
| Other                                                | 6%                                    | -                   | 5%                  | 10%                          | 4%                    | 7                              |

Table A-17. Directors: Form of charge for lending services (if library were to institute charges) by collection size of responding library

| Form of Charge Which Might<br>be Instituted | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                     |                     |                              |                       | Total<br>Res-<br>pond-<br>ents |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
|                                             | 20,000<br>-99,000                     | 100,000-<br>499,999 | 500,000<br>and over | Other<br>ARL<br>Mem-<br>bers | All<br>Lib-<br>raries |                                |
| Flat fee for each request                   | 31%                                   | 45%                 | 30%                 | 30%                          | 33%                   | 52                             |
| Different for filled/unfilled<br>requests   | 13%                                   | 38%                 | 52%                 | 20%                          | 43%                   | 68                             |
| Higher if verification<br>required          | 6%                                    | 41%                 | 41%                 | 50%                          | 38%                   | 60                             |
| Other                                       | 25%                                   | 14%                 | 7%                  | 5%                           | 10%                   | 16                             |

Table A-12 Directors: Effect of possible mandatory borrowing fee on ILL borrowing policies, by collection size of responding library

|                                             | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                             | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Effect of Fee                               |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| No change in borrowing policies or volume   | 7%                                    | 10%             | 22%              | 60%               | 21%           | 33                |
| Seek other sources for material needed      | -                                     | 14%             | 5%               | 10%               | 7%            | 10                |
| Change policies on user eligibility for ILL | 6%                                    | -               | 7%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| Pass charge on to patron making request     | 75%                                   | 55%             | 44%              | 20%               | 48%           | 75                |
| Other effects                               | 6%                                    | 21%             | 19%              | -                 | 16%           | 26                |
| Don't know                                  | -                                     | -               | 3%               | -                 | 2%            | 3                 |
| No answer                                   | 6%                                    | -               | -                | 10%               | 1%            | 2                 |
| TOTAL                                       | 100%                                  | 100%            | 100%             | 100%              | 100%          | 157               |



Table A-13 Directors: Patrons who would be charged for ILL borrowing services (if borrowing fee were instituted) by collection size of responding library

| Patron and Type of Charge          | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                    | 20,000-99,999                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Faculty                            |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| charge partial cost of fee         | -                                     | 7%              | 10%              | -                 | 8%            | 12                |
| charge total cost of fee           | 31%                                   | 48%             | 31%              | 10%               | 33%           | 52                |
| charge flat fee                    | 13%                                   | -               | 6%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| charge for cost of photo-copy only | 19%                                   | 10%             | 6%               | -                 | 8%            | 12                |
| no charge                          | -                                     | 4%              | 1%               | -                 | 1%            | 2                 |
| Staff                              |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| charge partial cost of fee         | -                                     | 4%              | 10%              | -                 | 7%            | 11                |
| charge total cost of fee           | 31%                                   | 41%             | 29%              | 10%               | 31%           | 48                |
| charge flat fee                    | 6%                                    | -               | 6%               | -                 | 4%            | 7                 |
| charge for cost of photo-copy only | 19%                                   | 7%              | 6%               | -                 | 7%            | 11                |
| no charge                          | -                                     | 10%             | 2%               | -                 | 3%            | 5                 |
| Master's candidates                |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| charge partial cost of fee         | -                                     | 14%             | 9%               | -                 | 8%            | 13                |
| charge total cost of fee           | 25%                                   | 41%             | 39%              | 10%               | 31%           | 48                |
| charge flat fee                    | 13%                                   | 4%              | 7%               | -                 | 6%            | 10                |
| charge for cost of photo-copy only | 6%                                    | 7%              | 7%               | -                 | 6%            | 10                |
| no charge                          | -                                     | 3%              | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| Doctoral candidates                |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| charge partial cost of fee         | -                                     | 10%             | 9%               | -                 | 8%            | 12                |
| charge total cost of fee           | 13%                                   | 24%             | 29%              | 10%               | 25%           | 40                |
| charge flat fee                    | 6%                                    | -               | 7%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| charge for cost of photo-copy only | 6%                                    | 4%              | 7%               | -                 | 6%            | 9                 |
| no charge                          | -                                     | 3%              | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| Undergraduates                     |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| charge partial cost of fee         | -                                     | 10%             | 3%               | -                 | 4%            | 6                 |
| charge total cost of fee           | 38%                                   | 28%             | 15%              | 10%               | 20%           | 31                |
| charge flat fee                    | 6%                                    | 4%              | 6%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| charge for cost of photo-copy only | 19%                                   | 3%              | 2%               | -                 | 3%            | 6                 |
| no charge                          | -                                     | 3%              | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |

Table A-13 (continued)

| Patron and Type of Charge         | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                   | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Other patrons                     |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| charge partial cost of fee        | -                                     | -               | 1%               | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| charge total cost of fee          | -                                     | -               | 2%               | -                 | 1%            | 2                 |
| charge flat fee                   | -                                     | -               | 1%               | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| charge for cost of photocopy only | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| no charge                         | -                                     | 3%              | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |

NOTE: This tabulation was not applicable for 40% of the 141 responding libraries.

Table A-14 Directors: Preferred method of paying and collecting fees (if fee system were instituted)  
by collection size of responding library

| Method of Payment and Collection of Fees                                              | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                                                                                       | 20,000-99,999                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Billing by lending library and payment by borrowing library against:                  |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| Individual transaction                                                                | 63%                                   | 28%             | 12%              | 10%               | 20%           | 32                |
| Monthly statement                                                                     | 6%                                    | 17%             | 11%              | 20%               | 12%           | 19                |
| Quarterly statement                                                                   | 13%                                   | 17%             | 14%              | -                 | 13%           | 21                |
| Semi-annual statement                                                                 | -                                     | 3%              | 2%               | 10%               | 3%            | 4                 |
| Annual statement                                                                      | 6%                                    | -               | 3%               | -                 | 3%            | 4                 |
| Clearinghouse operation with net billing or payment for individual libraries against: |                                       |                 |                  |                   |               |                   |
| Monthly statement                                                                     | -                                     | 3%              | 14%              | 10%               | 10%           | 16                |
| Quarterly statement                                                                   | 6%                                    | 14%             | 21%              | -                 | 17%           | 27                |
| Semi-annual statement                                                                 | 6%                                    | 7%              | 5%               | -                 | 5%            | 8                 |
| Annual statement                                                                      | -                                     | -               | 9%               | 20%               | 7%            | 11                |
| Deposit account                                                                       | -                                     | 11%             | 7%               | 20%               | 8%            | 12                |
| Other method                                                                          | -                                     | -               | 2%               | -                 | 1%            | 2                 |
| Don't know                                                                            | -                                     | -               | -                | -                 | -             | 0                 |
| No answer                                                                             | -                                     | -               | -                | 10%               | 1%            | 1                 |
| TOTAL                                                                                 | 100%                                  | 100%            | 100%             | 100%              | 100%          | 157               |

Table A-15 ILL Librarians: Policy on passing charges on to patron for photocopies obtained through ILL, by collection size of responding library

| Policy                | Collection Size, As Sampled (Volumes) |                 |                  |                   |               | Total Respondents |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|
|                       | 20,000-99,000                         | 100,000-499,999 | 500,000 and over | Other ARL Members | All Libraries |                   |
| Patron is not charged | 13%                                   | 7%              | 16%              | 40%               | 15%           | 24                |
| Patron is charged     | 80%                                   | 93%             | 84%              | 60%               | 84%           | 132               |
| Always                | 60%                                   | 80%             | 69%              | 40%               | 69%           | 108               |
| Only some patrons     | 13%                                   | 16%             | 9%               | -                 | 9%            | 14                |
| Other conditions      | 6%                                    | 3%              | 5%               | 20%               | 6%            | 9                 |
| Don't know/no answer  | -                                     | -               | 1%               | -                 | 1%            | 2                 |
| No Answer             | 7%                                    | -               | -                | -                 | 1%            | 1                 |
| TOTAL                 | 100%                                  | 100%            | 100%             | 100%              | 100%          | 141               |